READER RESPONSES OF TWO DIFFERENT DISCIPLINARY GROUPS OF SAUDI COLLEGE-LEVEL STUDENTS

by

ROKHSAREH KAZEMINAVA

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY in APPLIED LINGUISTICS
School of Applied Linguistics
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
Oct 2017

ABSTRACT

As writing and reading are interconnected activities and as learners are at the centre of learning process, this thesis employed a reader response activity in English classes of two disciplinary different college-level students to examine the SL learners' roles in the writing process. This study was motivated by three main research questions in the areas of the effect of learner variables on the choice of reading topics and the length of learners' responses, the textual characteristics of the responses, and writer's self-representation and reader engagement strategies. A sample of 600 student texts was analysed using referential statistics for addressing the question on learner variables, and text analysis, both manually and through a corpus tool, for the other two questions. The findings showed these students differed in their choices of reading topics and that the topic, the students' linguistic ability and discipline affected their responses. The text analysis revealed that most responses belonged to the levels 2 and 3 of cognitive engagement and that their generic structuring consisted of three main rhetorical moves. It also illustrated that personal pronouns were used for self-representation and reader engagement and had various rhetorical functions. The findings have wide-ranging pedagogical implications.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family. I am so grateful to my husband, Dr. Ahmad Omran, for his constant support and encouragement for my educational endeavours and his faith in my abilities. I also wish to thank my children, Sina and Setareh, and my son-in-law, Amiran, who have shown their care about this dissertation and supported my efforts. They are so special and their interest in my work has been a great motivating factor for continuing and accomplishing this task.

My gratitude also goes to my loving parents who have always had high aspiration for their children and instilled the value of education and hard work in all of us.

The love and support of my family during this doctoral process have proven that the largest task can be accomplished if the person takes one step at the time and has caring people around.

ACKNOWLEGEMENTS

I would like to thank my thesis supervisor, Dr. Suganthi John, for her boundless advice, constructive criticism, patience and encouragement in the conduction of this research and writing of the dissertation. Her constant presence and valuable feedback have been fundamental in the process of this study.

I also appreciate the members of my thesis' Examination Committee: the chairperson Dr. Crayton Walker, and the external and internal examiners, Dr. Isabel Herrand Rodrigo from the University of Zaragoza, Spain, and Dr. Petra Schoofs from the University of Birmingham, for agreeing to read my dissertation and be in the Committee. Their discussions, feedback and suggestions have been of great value in enriching my knowledge and experience.

I would also like to thank my colleagues who helped me with the coding of the samples, understanding and application of the corpus tools, creating SPSS files, and doing the needed statistical tests.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

An Overview of the Thesis

In any academic context, there are learning objectives and expectations that both instructors and students work towards achieving. Academic performance is usually evaluated by gauging the students' level of knowledge, ability to comprehend, ability to undertake insightful analysis, ability to apply their knowledge appropriately, and ability to synthesise and evaluate information (Krathwohl, 2002). Reading and writing are two language skills at the core of academic activity and are often required for determining the students' academic performance.

There have been a number of studies on the nature of these language skills (e.g., Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Coady, 1979; Goodman, 1967; Grabe, 1991; Hayes & Flower, 1980) and one area of English Language Teaching (ELT) has been the examination of the connection between these two skills as both of them are not only essential for successful academic performance (Graham & Hebert, 2010; Tsai, 2006) but also, a necessity in today's literate world (Ippolito, Steele, & Samson, 2008). Literature in general, supports the idea that reading and writing are active and constructive processes that lead to meaning making (e.g., Goodman, 1967; Grabe, 1991; Hirvela, 2001; McGinley, 1992; Meral & Ozen, 2003). Although termed as decoding and encoding acts (Flesch, 1955, as cited in Sitthitikul, 2014), reading and writing are now viewed as cognitive processes that learners go through in order to arrive at the meaning or create meaning (Becker, 2006; Goodman, 1967; Grabe, 1991; Langar & Filhan, 2000; Nation, 2001; Nunan, 1999; Smith, 1976; Weigle, 2002). Goodman's (1985) psycholinguistic model of reading defines reading not as picking up the information from a text in a letter-by-letter or word-by-word fashion, but as a selective process in which the readers' active interaction with the reading text and their prior knowledge or schema assists them in meaning making. In the same vein, the psycholinguistic view of writing holds that it is an active process involving the learner, the text, and the context. It is a reflective activity in which the writer needs to think about a specific topic and try to relate it to his/her background information in order to produce a text that is meaningful and coherent. Writing therefore, is a complex process that requires different sets of

knowledge and skills. It is a social act which demonstrates the writer's communication skills, which is sometimes challenging to develop and learn in EFL/ESL contexts (Ahmad, 2010; Shokrpour & Fallahzadeh, 2007). In relation to the connection between reading and writing, research findings support that better writers read more and better readers produce better sentence structures in their composition. This reinforces the notion that development in one skill, results in development in the other (Shen, 2008; Tierney, O'flahavan, & McGinley, 1989).

Hirvela (2001) asserts that reading in a second language is a complex task for many ESL/EFL students. While reading a piece of writing, the information is essentially extracted, based on the purpose of reading, the readers' interest, and their motivation. The readers' linguistic knowledge coupled with their world knowledge helps them make sense of the reading passages (Hirvela, 2001). Although acquiring reading skills can be difficult for many students, what is even more challenging for them is acquiring writing skills. SL learners are shown to have insufficient planning and revising skills and have more problems with accuracy and fluency in their writing (Weigle, 2002). Writing classes have at least two important benefits: they encourage students to think, organise their ideas, develop their summary writing skills and analyse and evaluate ideas. They also help to promote students' thinking and learning ability, and their metalinguistic knowledge. Many researchers (Cordon, 2000; Hirvela, 2001; Spack, 1988, as cited in Grabe, 1990) believe that English instructors need to engage students in composing tasks that are based on reading, an ability that is highly valued in academic settings. Grabe (1991) also stresses the need for reading and writing to be taught together for better academic preparation. It is argued that if students are not able to read and comprehend proficiently, they will also not be able to compose well. Therefore, most researchers in the field of reading and writing stress the need to integrate these skills (Cordon, 2000; Hirvela, 2001; Langar & Filhan, 2000; Liaw, 2007; McGinley, 1992; Meral & Ozen, 2003; Nunan, 1999; Oxford, 2001; Shen, 2008; Spivey & King, 1989; Smith, 1983; Tsai, 2006).

This pedagogical approach to teaching reading and writing gives centrality to the role of the learners in these two processes. Viewing learners as active agents in the learning process puts more emphasis on how best to address their needs. In fact, the psycho-social view of reading and writing, considers the role of the learner (learner variable) as one of the main factors in influencing the ability to read and write. Therefore, the learners' motivation, values, attitudes, cognitive abilities and processes, and long-term memory (e.g., task schemas, topic knowledge,

and language and discourse knowledge) have a collective role to play (Reid, 1993). ESL/EFL students usually have writing experience in their first language (L1). However, what is expected of them in their English writing classes might not match their expectations or skills. The students' differing educational, social, and cultural experiences might cause learning difficulties if the instruction in the second language (L2) does not take them into account (Ankawi, 2015).

In most Arab countries, ELT has had its place in their educational systems. However, along with implementation of English programs and writing courses, there have been research studies to find out the type of English language problems that Arab learners encounter (e.g., Abdul-Haq, 1982; Al Salmi, 2001a; Khan, 2011; Liton, 2012). Abdul-Haq's (1982) study shows that Arab students have serious problems with learning English, especially with acquiring writing skills. A wide-scale study conducted by Mukattash (1983) showed that the Arab students' problems related to English language acquisition fell largely into two categories: a) linguistic problems including pronunciation, spelling, capitalisation, morphology, and b) psycho-social problems including difficulty in expressing themselves effectively, whether in academic subjects or every-day situations. Among the many factors that researchers (e.g., Liton, 2012; Mukattash, 1983; Zughoul, 1987) cite as being the cause of problems for Arab students in the process of learning English, are the lack of interest in learning English and concurrently, an ineffective teaching methodology (Khan, 2011, Liton, 2012), two significant factors which motivated the undertaking of this study.

Rationale and Objectives of This Study

Having worked as an EFL instructor in Saudi Arabia, I have seen first-hand, the problems that Saudi EFL students face in learning English. The Saudi Ministry of Education is highly devoted to developing and improving EFL teaching in the country (Liton, 2012) and in 2003, mandated that teaching English in schools should start from grade six (Sayidina, 2010, as cited in Ankawi, 2015). Liton (2012) reviewing the development of EFL teaching practices in Saudi Arabia, mentions that in 1999, the Ministry of Education developed TEFL goals related to all four language skills in order to help its citizens, primarily the youngsters, communicate with English-speaking people. He then refers to Al-Hajilan's research which discusses two curriculum documents developed by the Ministry of Education to specify the objectives of TEFL in Saudi Arabia. The first curriculum was prepared in 1987 and the second curriculum, in 2000.

The teaching of English not only has support from the Saudi government, but also from the general public, mainly because English is widely used in arena of international trade, is at the core of the economy, the common language of aviation, in higher studies, research and other fields. However, the teaching does not seem to have been as effective as expected amongst Saudi students, especially those at the tertiary level (Ankawi, 2015; Liton, 2012). In spite of having a relatively good system of planning and curriculum setting, suitable text books, qualified teaching staff and helpful administration, the EFL teaching and learning in Saudi Arabia is not always successful, especially when it comes to skill development, particularly that of writing (Khan, 2011).

A number of studies have been conducted on Saudi EFL learners, with specific focus on their language learning problems (Ahmad, 2010; Al-Khairi, 2013; Al Nujaidi, 2003; Al Salmi, 2011a; Al Samadani 2011; Ankawi, 2015; El-Sayed, 1983; Khan, 2011; Mukattash, 1983; Nazim & Ahmad, 2012; Nezami, 2012). Khan (2011), for example, summarised the areas of language difficulties in Saudi students as pronunciation, phonemes, grammar, structure, capitalisation, punctuation, prepositions, subject-verb agreement, vocabulary and spelling. Studies have also shown that Saudi students have problems with reading and comprehension (Ahmad, 2010; Al Nujaidi, 2003; Al Salmi, 2011a; Al Samadani 2011; Nezami, 2012). Nezami's study (2012) investigated EFL learners' experience in reading classes and problematic areas related to this skill among male college students in Saudi Arabia. According to their teachers, these students lacked proper spelling and pronunciation skills and vocabulary knowledge, which led to their misunderstanding of the texts. Studies centred on exploring the writing difficulties encountered by these students (El-Sayed, 1983; Khan, 2011; Mukattash, 1983; Nazim & Ahmad, 2012) also point to their problems with spelling (Khan, 2011, Nazmi, 2012), syntactical inaccuracy (Al-Khairi, 2013; Nazmi, 2012), inadequate summarising and paraphrasing skills (Al-Kahiri, 2013; Nazmi, 2012), and deficiency in composition skills (Ankawi, 2015; Al-Khairi, 2013). Saudi students' scores in the writing skills section of the IELTS exam was the lowest (4.83/9) amongst the scores for other language skills in that exam (Garmi, 2010, as cited in Al-Khairi, 2013).

There is overwhelming evidence to suggest that Saudi students struggle with learning English skills. Lack of reading skills in Saudi students has been mainly attributed to their lack of interest in reading outside the classroom setting (Al Nujaidi, 2013; Alsamadani, 2011) including online English resources (Ankawi, 2015). Al Salmi (2011b) attributes these students' lack of

interest in reading to their deeply rooted fear of reading. With regards to these students' writing problems, researchers attribute them to their lack of interest and motivation (Ankawi, 2015; Mukattash, 1983; Liton, 2012), lack of training in writing (Al Humaidi, 2008), their unfavourable view of writing even in their own native language (Fageeh, 2003; Nazim & Ahmad, 2012), lack of authentic teaching materials (those not prepared specifically for pedagogical purposes) (Al Musallam, 2009), ignoring students' needs and interests in the selection of textbooks or topics meant for writing assignments (Al Musallam, 2009), and the interference of students' first language (Arabic) with English (Liton, 2012). Another important area of concern about Saudi learners' difficulty with writing is that Saudi EFL students perceive writing to be separated from thinking; they think of writing as a mechanical process of finding information, copying it, and creating a text (Al Sudies, 2005).

Al Humaidi (2008) explains that one problem in English writing classes is that instructors give students writing topics that might not be interesting to them. Therefore, Al Humaidi, like many educationists, advocates student involvement in choosing writing topics that interests them. Some studies on Saudi students have shown that these students have good attitudes towards learning English, which nurtured properly, could produce better learning outcomes (e.g., Monskovsky & Alrabai, 2009). In fact, Jahin and Idrees (2012) in their exploratory study assessing the writing proficiency level of Saudi EFL major students found that 46% of participants had a low proficiency level in writing, while 86% had positive views about learning English.

As explained earlier, learner variable is one main factor in language learning. Studies have shown that learner interest has a direct effect on reading comprehension and writing performance. Bean and Chien (2000), for example, examined the effect of topic interest and text difficulty level on students' comprehension and found that interest level was more important than text difficulty level in comprehension. If students were interested in a topic, they understood the reading passage better, even if its difficulty level was high. As for the notion of self-selection of topics, Sewell (2003, as cited in Bonyadi, 2014), for instance, stresses the importance of giving choice to students and argues that "allowing students to self-select their books results in more involvement and thus more motivation to read" (p. 5). In the same vein, Kragler (2000, as cited in Bonyadi, 2014) believes that giving choice to the students provides them with more opportunity to be entrenched in the learning process, promotes their interest, and elicits a sense

of ownership of their own learning process (p. 4). Others (e.g., Carroll, 1997; Threadkell, 2000, as cited in Bonyadi, 2014) similarly believe that self-selection of topics results in the students' increased ability to think critically, and induces a higher level of motivation and better comprehension ability. Yet others, investigating the effect of self-selected topics on the students' writing performance found that students who wrote on self-selected topics produced more fluent and longer texts (Ferrera, 2013), better quality writing and more complex syntax (Andrews, 1989; Bonyadi, 2014; Gradwohl & Scumacher, 1989), and a greater variety of words (Bonzo, 2008).

Bonyadi, Zeinalpur, and Reimany (2013, as cited in Bonyadi, 2014) investigated the perception of EFL students reflecting on self-selected and teacher-selected topics. The analysis showed that students overall felt more motivated when they had a choice, but a small percentage welcomed teacher-assigned topics. Therefore, the researchers recommended that EFL teachers should pay attention to this factor and give choices to their students in choosing their topics. Some other researchers (Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1982, as cited in Bonyadi, 2014) also claim that the self-selected topics are usually less demanding on the student's processing capability as they are usually familiar topics. Therefore, the use of journal writing or similar activities should be considered as instructional activities in EFL classes. Generally, literature on self-selection of topics shows that it has a facilitating effect on improving the students' writing skills. As Bonyadi (2014) concludes, use of self-selected topics in EFL classes supports the students' learning, and even advanced level students can perform better if they choose their own topics too. Therefore, giving students opportunities to read and write and exposing them to a wide variety of different genres, topics and styles are the best ways to foster their reading and writing skills (Langar & Filhan, 2000). This is the main objective of this study, to make a connection between reading, writing and thinking, in order to develop these skills amongst students and provide them with an opportunity to practice writing.

Contribution of This Dissertation to the Field of ELT

As most studies on Saudi students report lack of interest as one of the most important contributing factors to these students' reading and writing problems, this study aims to explore this issue through assigning a classroom task which brings both reading and writing together. The classroom task is reader response based which integrates these skills, and concurrently provides the students with an opportunity to practice writing. It also puts the students in the

centre of learning by giving them a choice in choosing reading topics that they have an interest in. By viewing students/learners as the main agents in the reading and writing process, this study aims to explore which reading topics learners are particularly interested in, how their choice is affected by their discipline or their level of language proficiency, and how they make meaning of the texts and create their own meaning (in writing). It further aims to explore how their creating meaning (response) is affected by their cognitive processing (level of cognitive involvement) and the level of language proficiency, how they shape their responses (genre) and whether their level of cognitive processing affects the shape of their responses, and finally how they present themselves as creators of meaning (writers) and engage their readers.

One factor in motivating students as mentioned at the outset is the use of the integrative approach in language classes where students can have access to authentic materials for their reading and writing. Many researchers believe that authentic materials can make students more interested in learning and developing their reading and writing skills (Brown, 2001; Carter & Nunan, 2001, as cited in Al Musallam, 2009; Morton, 1999; Nunan, 1999; Ur, 1996). One type of authentic reading material recommended highly for EFL classes is the use of literature (e.g., Al-Bulushi, 2011; Al-Mahrooqi, 2011a; Al-Mahrooqi, 2011b; Carlisle, 2000; Hirvela, 1996; Lee, 2013; Liaw, 2001). A theory in favour of the use of literature in classroom is the 'reader-response' theory developed by Rosenblatt (1978). It emphasises the interactive and transactional nature of reading and writing along with cognitive and affective benefits involved in this activity (e.g., Al-Mahrooqi, 2011a, 2011b; Hirvela, 1996; Liaw, 2001). The reader-response theory was the first to view reading and writing as processes of composing. This theory asserts that it is the readers who through their interaction with the text, create a unique meaning from the text. In addition, it allows readers to have a personal space for expressing their feelings about the text read, and show their cognitive abilities in analysing a piece of literary work.

Reader response theory has been mostly focussed on developing the students' reading skills by reading literary texts, chosen by instructors, and writing about them. It is an academic task that connects reading, writing and thinking, three skills and abilities that are important and valued for academic performance. However, to the best of my knowledge, there are no studies on the use of reader-response theory in a Saudi context. Although the use of literary texts could help to improve the students' reading and writing skills, the use of non-literary texts has also been shown to be useful for developing those same skills (Hirvela, 2001; Kasper, 1997). It would be

informative to examine how students respond to a non-literary text in a reader-response task. This study, therefore, aims to contribute to the reader-response literature by adding this aspect to this task. Hence, the use of the reader-response journal writing approach in an advanced EFL reading course in this study has a twofold purpose. Firstly, it aims to develop the students' reading skills in both literary and non-literary texts and secondly, to develop their writing skills by writing responses to these texts. In addition, unlike the usual reader-response studies where the selection of the reading topics is by the teachers, in this study, by adopting a learner-centred approach, students choose their own reading topics, something that rarely has been addressed in reader-response literature. Presenting students with a choice of reading topics not only addresses and considers learners' interest and motivation, but also affects their writing and the choices they make on approaching a writing task and choosing an appropriate rhetorical pattern for it (Zhang, 2004). As mentioned earlier, writing is a complex skill and there are many interdependent factors that affect the shaping of a text. The writer is the doer of the action (writing) and as a person brings his/her preferences and beliefs to the writing task. Also, the writers' cultural and social experiences shape their expression of their sense of self (identity). That is, the reading topics influence the decisions that the writers make and shape their stance towards the topics in their writing. Therefore, the topic is an essential factor that makes the writer decide what to write and how to write, but at the same time interacts and is interacted upon with other factors that affect writing as well. Zhang (2004) summarises the factors affecting formation of any text as "topic, the writers' freedom to choose and their variation on different topics, their stance in different topics, and their positioning in relation to topics, culture, and social and cultural contexts" (p. 12). In this study, by involving the students in the selection of their own reading and writing topics, it is hoped that they become more motivated in developing these skills and choosing the topic that they are interested in.

Knowledge of the students' reading topics of interest can further assist us in our teaching practices. Although there have been studies conducted, mostly using questionnaires and interviews, to explore attitudes of EFL students towards reading and their reading topics of interest (Al Jurf, 2004; Al Musallam, 2009; Al-Nafisah & Al-Shorman, 2010; Al-Shorman & Batineh, 2004; Gallik, 1999, as cited in Al-Nafisah & Al-Shorman, 2010; Xiaoping, 2011), there are limited empirical studies on the students' actual choice of reading topics and their writing performance (e.g., Andrews, 1989; Bonyadi, 2014; Ferrera, 2013; Gradwohl & Scumacher,

1989). This is another purpose of this study- to establish what reading topics the two groups of EFL students of different disciplines and different English proficiency levels choose to read and how authentic, self-selected reading topics, both literary and non-literary, affect their responses. One such effect could be the development of ideas and details in the reader response, which in turn affects the length of the text. Recent studies on the effects of length of student essays, usually determined by the word count, have shown that it is related to the quality of writing and the scores they receive (Abdel Latif, 2008, 2009; Deng & Shaw, 2007; Ferris, 1994; Grant & Ginther, 2000; Intaraprawt, 1995; Kobrin, Lanauze, & Snow, 1989). However, there is no literature on the relationship between the students' reading topics of interest and the length of their reader responses. It will therefore be of pedagogical value for us to know how reading topics affect the length of student responses.

While quality of writing in ELT literature is mainly related to the learners' linguistic ability and their text production skills, another measurement for assessing quality of writing that I believe is important and should be considered in studies on quality of writing, is what level of cognitive engagement with a reading text do learners exhibit in their writing (here reader responses). This not only highlights the cognitive aspect of reading and writing (Becker, 2006; Goodman, 1967; Grabe, 1991; Langar & Filhan, 2000; Reid, 1993; Smith, 1976; Weigle, 2002) and interconnectedness of reading, writing and thinking but also emphasises the learners' active role in meaning making- the level and depth of their engagement in thinking about different topics. To be able to do so, we first need to know what generic structure the responses generally have. We then can examine the texts to see whether there is any relationship between the level of cognitive engagement with the reading texts and the structure of reader responses. Although studies on reader responses (e.g., Al-Mahrooqi, 2011a & 2011b; Dekker, 1991; Dreyfuss & Barill, 2005; Hancock, 1993) and student reflective journals (e.g., Boud, Keogh & Walker, 1985; Flateby, 2009; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Mezirow 1990, as cited in Wong et al, 1995; Plack et al, 2007; Valli, 1997; Van Manen, 1977) have plenty to offer to this study on finding characteristics of student texts, whether from the perspectives of language or levels of reflectivity, there is no framework that encompasses and combines both of these perspectives. For the purpose of this study, in order to find characteristics of student responses in terms of their cognitive levels of engagement with the texts, a model needs to be developed to assess student responses, something that this study aims to do and to utilise.

With regards to the generic characteristics of reader responses, the literature seems to be lacking. Although numerous studies have been done on analysing genres of different academic (e.g., Bhatia, 1993; Connor & Mauranen, 1999; Feng & Shi, 2004; Gecikli, 2013; Hyland, 1990; Menezes, 2013; Nwogu, 1997; Swales, 1990; Yang, 2009; Zhen-ye, 2008) and non-academic texts (e.g., Bhatia, 1993; Cacchiani, 2007; Crossley, 2008; Ghaemi & Sheibani, 2014; Upton & Cohn, 2009), to the best of my knowledge there is a gap in literature regarding reader response genre. This calls for reviewing the literature in genre studies mentioned above and studying and critically evaluating the findings derived from the analysis of students' reader responses in order to determine their generic structure. This is what this study also aims to achieve.

Another aspect of interconnection between thinking, reading and especially writing is how learners see their role as writer and use personal pronouns to present themselves in their responses (writer identity) and engage their readers. Also related to this is whether there is a relationship between the use of personal pronouns for self-representation, reader engagement and learners' level of cognitive engagement with the texts. This can shed light on our understanding of how learners' perception of themselves as writers affects their text production. There is a large body of literature devoted to writer identity and writer presence (e.g., Hyland, 2001, 2002, 2005; Ivanič & Camps, 2001; John, 2007). Although use of personal pronouns and their rhetorical functions have been subject of many studies (e.g., Chang, 2014; De Hoop & Hogeweg, 2014; Fortanet, 2004; Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990; Kuo, 1999; Natsukari, 2012; Petch-Tyson, 1998; Tang & John, 1999), it seems there are no studies done regarding them in a reader response task, nor is there any study on how these pronouns are used in different texts or responses showing different levels of the writer's cognitive engagement. Therefore, the findings of this study could enrich the literature in this area too.

In summary, findings of this research would be instructive for EFL/ESL teachers to know what kind of authentic texts and reading topics are of interest to students to read and write about so that they can use this information in their writing and reading classes and with students of different proficiency levels. This will help in having a more student-centred approach in classroom-settings. It would also be beneficial to know what levels of cognitive involvement students show in their writing and what generic characteristics their responses to reading texts have, if any. Being aware of different levels of cognitive involvement can shed some light on what forms of comprehension can be stressed and developed in classroom tasks. Additionally,

knowing about how students show their presence and identity in the texts (authorial self) and how they engage their readers can add to the wealth of existing knowledge in this area.

Research Questions

Using reader response journals in an advanced EFL reading class, where students can choose their own reading topics of interest from authentic sources, this study aims to examine the following questions:

1. What reading topics do EFL students choose to read when they are given the choice? Does their disciplinary specialisation impact on their choice of topics? Does the choice of topics affect the length of their responses?
2. How are the students' responses characterised in terms of levels of cognitive engagement with the reading text? How are their responses generically structured? Is there interplay between the levels of cognitive engagement and the generic structure of the student responses?
3. As writers and creators of these texts, how do students use personal pronouns for self-representation and reader engagement? What rhetorical functions do these personal pronouns perform?

As mentioned above, findings of this exploratory research will shed light on some areas that are important but have seldom been addressed in ELT literature. The next section will explain the organisation of this chapter.

Organisation of the Dissertation

This dissertation consists of five chapters. The first one is the Introduction which briefly overviews the basic premise of this study, problem identification, aims of the study, and research questions. The second chapter is the Literature Review. This chapter includes a reasonable amount of literature about all the main concepts that the research questions are related to: connection between reading and writing, learner variables in reading and writing, role of topics, reader response theory, quality of writing, assessing cognitive/reflectivity in texts, developing a model for assessing levels of cognitive engagement, genre analysis studies, and use of personal pronouns and their rhetorical functions for self-representation and reader engagement. The third chapter is on Research Methodology. An important part of this research was the methodology used. It was felt that for each area of research inquiry, a certain type of methodology needed to be employed, such as methodology in categorisation of reading topics, in determining the level

of cognitive involvement, and in finding generic characteristics of reader responses. At times, it was felt that inclusion of samples of original reading texts or student responses was needed to demonstrate the methodology used. The challenges encountered and ways of overcoming them are also discussed. Results and Discussions are found in the fourth chapter of this dissertation, where the findings are presented and discussed in detail. The last chapter is devoted to Conclusion, Pedagogical Implications and Recommendations for Future Research. The References and Appendices sections will be presented at the end of this work.

CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical premise of this study relates to the interconnection between reading, writing and thinking. Therefore, the research questions of this study are multifaceted and focus on different aspects of EFL students' reader responses. The first question centres on the choice of reading topics, which to a certain extent is related to the student motivation and its relationship in particular to the student's disciplines. The relationship between the self-selection of topics and quality of responses also requires a reference to the literature that deal with these issues. Question two relates to the characteristics of student responses; both in terms of the level of cognitive involvement the students have with the reading texts and the generic structure of their reader responses. These touch upon two important areas of literature: connection of writing and thinking and levels of reflectivity, and genre studies. The third question of this study is concerned with the role of students as writers. It focuses on discourse analysis of an important linguistic element, namely the use of personal pronouns for self-representation and reader engagement. It further aims to explore the rhetorical functions that these pronouns perform in shaping student responses. The various aspects of this study therefore require detailed exploration and critical review of the relevant literature.

SECTION 1

2.1.1 Reading and Writing Connection

Relevant to the present study is the discussion of the interconnection between reading and writing. Many researchers now believe that reading and writing form important relations with each other: as skills, as cognitive processes, and as ways of learning. Stolsky's research (1983, as cited in Grabe, 1991) on the relationship between reading and writing displayed that better readers were better writers, better writers read more, better readers wrote more complex sentences and texts, and reading was more effective in helping a student's writing than grammar instruction. Researchers tend to consider this particular connection not as much as a cause and

effect relationship but more of a ‘separate but interdependent and interrelated acts’ type of relationship (Langar & Filhan, 2000).

In the following sections, some cognitive similarities involved in reading and writing and the specific differences between these two and the nature of the inter-relationship between them are discussed.

2.1.1.1 Similarities and differences in reading and writing processes.

In constructivist’s view, reading and writing developments are seen as sophisticated rule-governed representations whereby the learner is actively involved in problem-solving relying on his/her background knowledge, text, and context. Constructivists argue and research findings show that writing and reading have similar cognitive processes involved; they are both meaning-making processes. Meaning is made when people get involved in writing and reading. The mind anticipates, looks back and evaluates the ideas that change and evolve as meaning develops. Language and sentence structures are all important as texts-in-the-head and texts-on-paper take shape. While writing, the writers usually read some texts and place themselves in the place of their readers to check whether their text would be readable and understandable to their readers. Similarly, in a reading task, the readers are considered to be a writer in the way that they try to anticipate not only the upcoming content but also its language and rhetoric. This way, both reading and writing are considered similar composing activities in that writers and readers need to use similar knowledge to be able to make meaning: knowledge about language, content, genre conventions, pragmatics, the interaction (between the reader and the writer), and knowledge of purpose (Langar & Filhan, 2000).

2.1.1.2 The interactive relationship between reading and writing.

Many researchers investigated the effect of reading on student composition. They found that reading can be used as a model for writing, for learning about the linguistic features of texts, for vocabulary gain, and for learning about the rhetoric/genre of texts (e.g., Corden, 2000; Echoff, 1984; Krashen & Lee, 2004; McGinley, 1992; Shen, 2008; Smith, 1983; Spivey & King, 1989; Tierney, O’flahavan, & McGinley, 1989).

Krashen and Lee (2004) proposed the notion of ‘Reading Hypothesis’ (in relation to the use of inverted commas here and in subsequent similar cases, see Table 3.7, item 1.a). They argue that through reading, readers can learn about the language, its use, its grammar, and its discourse styles. Connection of reading and writing has been shown in many studies (e.g., Corden, 2000;

Dressel, 1990; Echoff, 1984) whereby students' writing showed characteristics of the reading passage they had read such as its vocabulary, content, and grammatical structures (Corden, 2000). Smith's (1983, as cited in Shen, 2008) 'reading like a writer theory' supports the positive effects of reading on writing and argues that while reading, the reader will unconsciously learn the rules of writing, given certain conditions are met (i.e. lack of anxiety, comprehension of the text, and perception of self as writer) in which case the reader will be sensitive to the style and mechanics of that text and reads like a writer.

Relevant studies to this study are those which investigated the effect of reading on writing of EFL students (e.g., AlKhawaldeh, 2011; Tabatabaei & Amin, 2012; Zainal & Mohamed Husin, 2011). Alkhawaldeh (2011) examined whether awareness of the relationship between EFL reading and writing and its effect on students' composition skills could have any impact on their writing. He found that the difference between the compositions of the two groups of Arab EFL students in his study was significant. Tabatabaei and Amin's study (2012) on Iranian EFL students showed that having a 'reading to writing' approach and focusing on the use of reading texts of different rhetorical modes affected students' composition greatly and differently and that more proficient students showed greater improvement using the reading texts. EFL students' writing after reading a text has also been examined in Zainal and Mohamed Husin's study (2011) and was found to be superior to those writing without reading. The difficulties that students had in writing without reading were mainly the lack of ideas and weak vocabulary. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that these two skills reinforce each other.

Another relevant work is Shen's study (2008) in which she investigated how an integrated reading and writing project would help EFL learners' literacy development and their personal growth. Three approaches were taken to make the connection between reading and writing: explicit instruction of text organisation and story elements, reflective reading journal based on reading texts, and creative writing based on the story selected by the learner. The findings showed that reading was especially helpful by providing the students with a stimulus, modelling structure, vocabulary, and prior knowledge. It also had a positive impact on the students' reading, metacognitive awareness as well as reflecting on it in terms of their own personal experiences. Shen concluded that writing is a 'recursive process' not linear, something which other researchers asserted too (e.g., McGinley, 1992).

The direction of the relationship between reading and writing has also been investigated (e.g., Shanahan & Lomax, 1986 & 1988; Zainal & Mohamed Husin, 2011). Using different theoretical models to find the direction, Shanahan and Lomax (1986) found the 'reading-to-writing' model was superior to 'writing-to-reading', but the 'interactive model' was superior to the other two models. They concluded that the finding that 'reading-to-writing' is superior to 'writing-to-reading' suggests the transfer of knowledge is mostly from reading to writing, something which has been reported by others as well (e.g., Zainal & Mohamed Husin, 2011). They, however, concluded that reading and writing need to be taught together so that the information and skills acquired in each can be transferred to the other. That is what most linguists and educationists now believe- that there is an interactive relationship between reading and writing. Therefore, it can be argued that the reader response task, which this study plans to use, reinforces both of these skills.

Through the literature review mentioned above, we saw that both reading and writing are cognitive activities that are influenced by psychological, social and cultural contexts. In the following section, the element of thinking in the reading and writing acts is discussed.

2.1.2 Reading, Writing, and Thinking

The relationship between language and thinking has long been theorised (Vygotsky, 1962). Reading as a linguistic skill is believed to be a thinking process. The reader needs to understand the text and use several skills such as inferring, questioning, predicting, and concluding to gain information from the texts. In the same vein, writing is a learned process of putting thoughts and experiences into text. Development of thinking skills is an essential part of a good writing. Applebee defines writing as externalisation and reshaping of our thoughts (1984, as cited in McGinley et al, 1989). Hence, to think that writing is separate from the beliefs and feelings of the writer is not to address writing as a reflective tool in meaning making (Zainal & Mohamed Husin, 2011).

Some researchers looked at actual cognitive aspect of reading and writing acts in collecting information and composing texts (e.g., McGinley, 1992; Spivey & King, 1989). They used terms such as 'synergistic' (McGinley, 1992) and 'symbiotic' (Tierney, O'flahavan, & McGinley, 1989) to define the relationship between reading and writing. Writing tasks especially those based on readings are a recursive process and affect the writer's reasoning operations such as use of schema, questioning, paraphrasing, restating contents and hypothesising (McGinley,

1992). It has also been found that the reading ability affects selection of appropriate reading content by the more proficient readers, incorporating more content, providing comparatively more elaboration, and connectivity of sentences in the text (Spivey & King, 1989). Therefore, it has been argued that when composing from sources, the students' roles switch back and forth between reader/writer, which makes it at times impossible to differentiate what they are doing as reader or as writer alone (Spivey & King, 1989). This and the following study (Tierney et al, 1989) are relevant to the present study which aims to explore how reading topics affect EFL students' writing, students who have different language proficiency levels. In Tierney et al's study (1989), the objective was to find out which approach (combined reading and writing, writing and reading done separately, and writing in combination with some questions and knowledge activation activities) promote critical thinking. After the task, all participants had to write an argumentative essay. The analysis of the quality of students' essays (measured by the number of T-units) showed that those reading editorials produced longer essays. Additionally, those involved in reading and writing, showed more critical and evaluative thinking than those who only read or wrote. Based on their findings, Tierney et al suggest that when students are engaged in a combined reading and writing activity, a 'symbiotic' relationship is formed.

Moreover, the connection of reading, writing and thinking is that "writing is a straightforward act of saying what the writer can mean, the mental struggles writers go through, and the interpretations readers make" (Flower & Hayes, 1990, as cited in Bahrebar & Darabad, p. 172). It has also been described as an 'inquiry process' and 'problem-solving' process (Jacob, 2002, as cited in Lareaus, Pandolfio, Rand & Turner, 2006) whereby students go through several steps to solve the problem (composition) by using their personal experiences and world knowledge to a) support specific details, b) negate or generalise a point about the text or take a position on the topic, and c) predict argumentation and thus be ready to defend their position and refute that of their opponents. As such, it relates to a higher order of thinking, i.e. critical thinking. Critical thinking involves the use of information, experience, and world knowledge in a way by which the learner can find alternatives, make inferences, pose questions, and solve problems (Elder & Paul, 1994). Many researchers therefore argue that critical thinking is a must in today's knowledge-based society and EFL classes should prepare students not only to face the world with proper language skills but also to use cognitive skills that facilitate their assimilation into this society and meet the requirement for success in the academic world (e.g., Elder & Paul,

1994; Liaw, 2007; Vähäpässi, 1982, as cited in Weigle, 2002). One way that teachers can develop students' critical thinking is by involving students in various writing tasks. Vähäpässi (1982, as cited in Weigle, 2002) explains that writing tasks can be cognitively divided into reproduction (e.g., copying, quoting), organising/ reorganising (e.g., summary writing, reports) and inventing/generating (e.g., commentaries, reflective writing, editorials). Vähäpässi emphasises that this third type of writing is the one that is highly valued in academic process.

In fact, there have been different pedagogical approaches to foster student reading and writing skills in the form of learning tasks. However, many of them have focused on only a certain aspect of the reading and writing process (Raims, 1991). Raims (1991) argues that there are four elements involved in writing: form, writer, content, reader, and we cannot take one approach and focus on one and discard others. Nunan (1989, as cited in Tabatabaei & Amin, 2012) perceives tasks as classroom works which engage students in comprehending, manipulating, producing, or interacting in the second language with a focus on making meaning rather than on form. The findings of the studies mentioned above and the educationists' views on learning tasks are relevant to the present study and confirm the fact that reading, writing and thinking are intertwined processes and that all three are present in a reader response task. In fact, based on what research informs us about the nature of reading and writing connection and characteristics of learning tasks, teachers have used different classroom approaches and tasks to promote reading and writing skills among students, such as Free Voluntary Reading (e.g., Krashen, 2003), extensive reading (e.g., Brown, 2001; Nation, 2001), and the use of literature and reader response journals (Rosenblatt, 1978).

The last approach is relevant to this study and will be discussed next.

2.1.2.1 Use of literature and reader-response journals.

Teachers have used different types of literature in language classes for a long time, from poetry, coining the term 'formeaning' (Kellem, 2009), to the use of novels and short stories. However, the reader response theory refers to the responses that students write after reading literary works, novels and short stories, in language classes. This approach was the first to see reading and writing as processes of composing. According to this theory, the reading of any given text might be different based on who reads it because readers bring their linguistic knowledge, prior knowledge and world knowledge to help them understand the text. This theory proposes that it is the reader who through his/her interaction with the text, derives a unique

meaning from the text. The focal point in any reading activity then is the reader, not the text or the writer. It is based on the theory of constructivism which asserts that the act of reading is inseparable from the reader (Alkhawaldeh, 2011; Kellem, 2009; Rosenblatt, 1978).

Reader- response theory was first introduced by Rosenblatt (1978). She implemented reader- response in her reading class and found that each student's interpretation of the literary text was unique and dependent on her/his own interaction with the text. Rosenblatt considers reading as a nonlinear transaction between the text and the reader, and meaning is not created by a predetermined interpretation of the text but by a unique person who uses his/her emotions, background knowledge, and ideas to create meaning in the context of a particular time and place. She places reading transactions on a spectrum of 'efferent' stance*,* reading for extracting information, to 'aesthetic stance'*,* reading for experience and pleasure.

Krashen (2003) also advocates incorporating literature into EFL classrooms. He calls it 'sheltered popular literature activity'. This is a light but authentic reading activity and his argument is that "acquisition of any written style should facilitate the comprehension of any other; while there are differences among different types of prose, there is also significant overlap. Someone who can read light fiction easily has also acquired what is needed for academic reading" (Krashen, 2003, p. 26). Some researchers have gone even further and related the reader-response theory to the connection of reading, writing and thinking. Meral and Ozen (2003) argue that the use of literary work is important since literature has its own context. It provides a good setting for students to get involved in a more meaningful activity rather than artificial classroom activity. In a study, Liaw (2001) examined the effect of reader-response theory on EFL students in a Taiwanese context. The students had to read short stories and write their responses to them. The finding indicated that students showed most interest when they could personally relate to the characters and themes of the stories and respond to them. Moreover, Spack (1985) showed how ESL students can benefit from an integrated approach to reading and writing especially when the content of their reading and their topic for writing is literature. Spack argues that reader response approach actively engages students to explore and discover meaning through reading and writing, which eventually helps them achieve a certain level of automaticity in writing and be prepared to produce texts of the standard that students are required to write for their college courses.

Some other researchers, however, recommend use of all text types and not only literary works in the EFL/ESL classrooms. A study done by Kasper (1997) on students' performance in two groups of reading literary and non-literary texts showed that students in non-literary group outperformed the other group reading the literary texts. Students also preferred non-literary texts to the literary ones. In Hirvela's study (2001) on ESL students both literary and non-literary texts were used as source materials. Students read both types of texts and had to write responses and synthesise information among other things. There was a great popularity for reading in L1 rather than reading in English. Their attitude towards text types and reading /writing activities was mostly toward literary and semi-literary texts. They thought that academic readings were most helpful with a slight preference for it over the others. Therefore, Hirvela recommends that incorporating reading into a writing course is perhaps best done by using a variety of reading texts with different genres so that students can respond to the wide array of composing formats. Hirvela (2001) believes that writing about both literary and non-literary texts assists students to write in different discourse types.

The use of reader response journals in this study is as a way of encouraging students to read authentic texts beside their reading textbooks; however, instead of the teacher providing the students with reading texts it will be students themselves who will be choosing the reading texts of their interest and discussing them in the form of reader responses. We can see that this activity may be a good learning task to be chosen for this research since it encompasses Ellis's definition of learning tasks mentioned earlier and has all four principles of learning tasks that Phillips mentioned: the principles of reality control, non-trivialising, authenticity, and tolerance of error (1981, as cited in Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001, p. 183). This brings us to the issue of the role of topics in student reading and writing which will be discussed next.

SECTION 2

2.2.1 Reading Topics and Learners' Reading and Writing Performance

The main aspect of question one of this study concerns reading topics and their role in student responses. In fact, it is an important factor in reading and writing. If the topic is unfamiliar, the learners, especially second language (SL) learners, need more processing time to assimilate and accommodate it through their mental processing (Chang, 2006).

The issue of topics in writing classes has its roots in the belief of the instructors. If they subscribe to a form-focused approach, they provide the topic to the students to practice their grammar, sentence, and structural skills. But if they adopt a writer-focused approach called process approach, they allow the students the chance to choose their own topics and using their personal experiences, write about ideas that are of interest to them or respond to a work of literature (Raims, 1991).

A brief review of ELT/ESL/EFL literature shows researchers' recommendations for choice of topics for student reading and writing. Langar and Filhan (2000), for example, believe that it is best that students have numerous opportunities to read and write, and are exposed to a body of literature representing different genres, topics and styles. They argue that if students are required to choose the text they are interested in to read and write about, particularly if they choose the ones they are familiar with, this can positively affect their attitude towards reading and writing and learning in general. Students compose and make connection between their prior knowledge and experience with what they are reading.

How a writing topic could possibly affect student texts, is another area related to this current study. Reid (1990) analysed the discourse of 768 responses of the four writing prompts used in Carlson et al's research which were written by students from 4 different linguistic backgrounds including those coming from an English speaking background. She found that student texts were significantly different from topic type to topic type in several ways. For example, students who wrote on material presented in a graph form produced longer essays than those written in the compare/contrast form. Also, the graph prompt produced more lexical patterns which were abstract, formal academic prose, while the compare/contrast prompt elicited more informal and concrete discourse. Teachers, therefore, can help students to expand their understanding by asking them to write responses to a variety of text types. The reader response theory seems to be a good vehicle for this pedagogical objective.

What happens when the reading or writing topic is familiar is that in the reading act, there is an interaction between the learner variables (learner's interest in the topic, purpose of reading and writing, prior knowledge about the content) and text variables (genre, vocabulary, grammar) that helps the learner to understand a text (Hosenfeld, 1979, as cited in Alsamdani, 2011) and compose a text. In fact, empirical studies have shown that activating prior knowledge played an important role in students' comprehension and recall of a reading text (Chang, 2006; Correll,

1987, DeGroff, 1989) and even argued (Hudson, 1982, as cited in Grabe, 1991) that having a high degree of prior knowledge or schema can overcome linguistic deficiencies.
This is also related to the current study to examine how students write about reading topics that they are more interested in and supposedly more familiar with.

2.2.1.1 Language proficiency, topic familiarity, and text comprehension.

Some other researchers examined the role of language proficiency level and content familiarity on text comprehension. Al-Shumaimari (2006) conducted such a study on 132 male and female Saudi undergraduate EFL students. He found that both high and low language ability groups gained higher scores on familiar texts than on unfamiliar ones, a result that supports the schema theory. The language element significantly affected students' comprehension. In both cases of familiar and unfamiliar content, high-ability students outperformed the less proficient students. Moreover, lack of content knowledge affected the low-ability students but not the high-proficient ones. Al-Shumaimari believes one explanation for this, may be that content knowledge can help low-ability students but is not necessary for high-ability students as their knowledge of the language, vocabulary and reading skills help them have more freedom to analyse new information and assimilate or accommodate them, rather than all their cognitive resources being tied up at lower-level processing of the text (as seems to be the case with the low-proficient learners). Likewise, Clapham's (2001) large scale study on the effect of background knowledge on the reading test performance of EFL students showed that those who read a topic related to their field received higher marks on the test than those who had read unrelated readings. The content schema also had an important role in Johnson's study (1981) on ESL learners which showed that content familiarity had more effect on the comprehension than text structure and text language level. It confirms that reading is a content specific activity and content schema is a facilitator in L1 and L2 reading activities. In a similar study, Brantmeier (2003) found that subject matter familiarity had a facilitating effect on reading comprehension.

This is related to this current study since the two groups of pre-nursing and pre-med students involved in this study have different language proficiency levels and knowledge about their choice of topics and the consequent effect the circumstances have on their writing is the focus of the first question of this study.

2.2.1.2 Role of culture in reading and writing acts.

Another facet of reading and writing task is the socio cultural factors. According to schema theory, a mismatch between the information in the text and the readers' prior knowledge can cause difficulties. This can also happen if the information is totally new to the reader. To overcome these difficulties, readers might distort the new information or just omit it (Carrell, 1981, as cited in Al-Mahrooqi, 2011a). This shows the important role the readers' personal experience including their culture, plays in their comprehension of texts. In short, texts that are of a familiar culture are easier to read and recall than those that are based on an unfamiliar culture even if they are linguistically at the level of the readers' proficiency (Al-Mahrooqi, 2011a; Zhang, 2004). Zhang (2004) studied three different groups of EFL students' writing to explore the interactive relationship of topic influence, individual (culture) stance, and text types in various cultural contexts. All these 3 groups had to write in response to three essay topics, some of which were culturally unfamiliar to them. The finding showed that the culturally familiar topics elicited more spoken style of writing and produced texts that had argumentation features, while the unfamiliar topics elicited texts which had written discourse features and students took an analytical position regarding the topics. The results of the study indicated that the cultural stance that the writers took toward different topics influenced the text types produced. Other studies (e.g., Floyed & Carrell, 1987, as cited in Brantmeier, 2003) have shown that cultural familiarity of the text content is more significant in comprehension than the structural complexity of the text. Similarly, Al Mahrooqi (2011a) stresses that reading the literature of an unfamiliar culture in EFL/ESL can be challenging. She explains that EFL/ESL students' difficulty in dealing with English literature is that they approach the texts from their own knowledge-base rooted in their culture. In her study on 23 Omani female students reading an American short story, she found that language of the text (i.e. cohesion and coherence) positively affected the reading of a text that was on a culturally unfamiliar content. Overall, it is not only the level of L2 proficiency that affects comprehension but also the topic of the text as well as the linguistic features of the text.

Another area related to the reading and writing topics is not surprisingly, the effect they have on the cognitive engagement of learners. This is another aspect of the current study; to explore how different reading topics affect students' cognitive engagement with the text. In a study done by Stapleton (2001), the relation between critical thinking and topics was examined

and the results showed that the quality of critical thinking was positively related to the topic content; that is, the familiar topic generated a higher level of critical thinking.

The current study, by requiring students to choose the topics of their own interest, hopes to facilitate students' choice of finding culturally familiar topics which presumably would promote more critical thinking in the students. It also hopes that students' choice of authentic texts, those not explicitly written for the pedagogical purposes, would elicit better motivation and engagement with the texts. The next section sheds some light on the use of authentic texts for learning purposes.

2.2.2 Use of Authentic Reading Materials and Student Motivation

Another area of literature that relates to this thesis is the role of student's motivation in selecting reading topics from a vast source of authentic reading materials. Student motivation and interest are among the most important psychological factors that affect their performance. If students' interest is not considered, they might not show any enthusiasm in reading, whether it is in L1 or L2. This will inhibit their semantic and grammar knowledge, recognition of rhetorical patterns, learning about different text genres, utilising cues to predict meaning, and learning about different aims of reading and formulating reading strategies. More importantly, they might not be able to develop their self-growth or gain self-confidence (Cheng, 1998, as cited in Alsamadani, 2011).

Providing students with reading materials of their interest is one way that can motivate them to read and consequently develop their reading skills. Most educators recommend giving a choice to students to choose readings based on their personal interests so that they can develop their literacy skills (e.g., Brown, 2001; Nunan, 1999; Ur, 1996). Based on these recommendations, many teachers have tried to build opportunities in their teaching curriculum for students to self-select reading material that are of interest to them.

The importance of considering the student's interest in selecting reading material relies on the fact that there is a connection between reading interest and reading comprehension. In a study conducted by Spache (as cited in Al-Nafisah & Al-Shorman, 2010), it was shown that when the reading material is of high interest to the students, they can read them well even if it is 2 to 3 levels above their reading proficiency level. But if the students' interest is low, they might consider those books too difficult even if the books are well below their proficiency level. Similarly, in some other studies (e.g., Bean & Chien, 2000; Renninger, 1988) it was shown that

students were more competent and performed better in their reading when the context was of high interest and required high knowledge rather than contexts that included high levels of knowledge but low-levels of interest.

Since student interest is an important variable in any type of learning, some researchers attempted to investigate what reading topics students are interested to read (Al Jurf, 2004; Al-Kutob, 1981, as cited in Al-Nafisah & Al-Shorman, 2010; Al Musallam, 2009; Xiaoping, 2011). Yu, Fan and Li (2008, as cited in Xiaoping, 2011) surveyed some Chinese undergraduates and found that they were interested in topics related to their daily life such as friendship, success, and career. Xiaoping's (2011) study on Chinese students showed that the 10 areas of interest for them were mental health, relationships, career and profession, communication and other professional skills, social problems and social services, environmental sciences, entertainment, literature, healthy living, and management skills. Al-Kutob (1981, as cited in Al-Nafisah & Al-Shorman, 2010) studied Kuwaiti young people's attitudes towards reading and their reading interests. The result showed that they preferred to read Arabic newspapers, magazines, and books on the subjects of religion, literature and social issues. In a context similar to the present study, Al Jurf (2004) found that 77% of female Saudi students in her study read light women's magazines on topics that were advertised on satellite channels. In Al Musallam's study (2009) on female Saudi EFL learners, the participants showed interests in topics such as world news, education, health, sports, and fashion. Al-Nafisah and Al-Shorman' study (2010) on Saudi male EFL students showed that they had a wide range of reading interests. Stories, adventure books, religious books, magazines about the internet, newspaper, computer magazines, technology magazines, sports, local newspapers, newspaper sport section, books on the internet, picture magazines, novels and poetry were among the 15 top choices.

Although learner interest is an important aspect of learning and critical for academic performance, a quick review of literature makes it clear that most recent research investigating students' interests are based on surveys and not on an actual analysis of students' choice of texts they read, which is the approach that this study is planning to use. Moreover, the literature on learner interest is usually on how to best motivate students to engage in their studies (Driscoll, Gelabert, & Richardson, 2010), and concurrently, there is little literature (as such mentioned above) on how reading topics affect students' writing performance.

However, there have been several recommendations on ways to arouse student interest in reading and writing. One of those ways has been to use authentic texts in the classroom (Brown, 2001, Widdowson, 1996). Herron and Seay (1991, as cited in Al-Musallam, 2009) assert that 'live' texts unlike texts that are purposefully made for teaching purposes foster student learning and interest by connecting form to meaning, by putting communication first, and by presenting the culture of the native speakers.

Authentic language has been defined as 'real' language, not 'canned' or 'stilted' language (Brown, 2001, p. 90), and the language that is 'natural' (Brown, 2004). Adopting authentic language approach means using real, context embedded and having whole-language approach in classrooms (Brown, 2001, p. 90). Nunan (1999) refers to authentic materials as those that have not been specifically produced for pedagogical purposes. To summarise, authentic material is "the kind of language which is used by native speakers' community orally or in writing, and which is not simplified for FL/SL learning purposes" (Al Musallam, 2009, p. 14). Widdoson (1996) argues that if learners are to learn a language to be able to communicate, they need to have exposure to real communicative examples. He further elaborates "if you are going to teach real English as it functions in contextually appropriate ways, rather than a collection of linguistic forms in contrived forms in contrived classroom situation, then you need to refer to it and defer to, how people who have the language as an L1 actually put it to communicative use" (1996, p. 67).

2.2.2.1 Effects of authentic materials on thinking and affect.

Some researchers support the positive effects of authentic material for affective and cognitive reasons (e.g., Bacon & Finnemann, 1990; Breen, 1985). Breen (1985) believes that use of authentic material in the classroom will help learners to have enough input to be prepared for cognitively demanding academic life. Besides, some textbooks are shown to be so contrived that they do not prepare students for the outside world (Swan, 1991). Other studies have shown an increase in students' motivation and satisfaction due to the use of authentic listening and reading materials (Al Musallam, 2009; Liaw, 2001; Peacock, 1997; Young, 1999). Liaw (2001) used short stories in her study, which was based on the rationale that they fit the current EFL recommendations, namely the use of authentic materials, whole language (integration) approach, and cooperative learning techniques. The purpose was for the students to become more motivated, to have more active role in reading, to experience the aesthetic aspect of the foreign

language and reflect on it. The analysis of the student reader responses showed that they were not merely comprehending the texts, but showed that the students had been actively engaged with the texts at different levels to make meaning of them. In an Arab context, Al-Bulushi (2011) used reader response task with his high school students in Oman. The findings showed that the students had a good level of comprehension, more satisfaction with the literature class, and more positive attitudes towards the authentic texts. The students also felt that this approach helped them to think more critically about the characters and events, activated their background knowledge, and improved their imaginative thinking. Al-Bulushi, therefore, suggests that teachers and curriculum planners should pay more attention to implementing approaches that are student-centred, that cultivate critical thinking, and that foster autonomous learners, all of which are seen in the reader response activity of this study.

Beside the studies mentioned above, in the Saudi context, there has been one study on the use of authentic materials. Al-Musallam (2009) studied the EFL teachers and students' (majoring in EFL) attitudes towards the use of authentic materials in reading classes. His findings showed that Saudi EFL students had high regard for the use of authentic texts in their reading classes. They seemed to enjoy reading texts that were not similar to their textbooks and believed that authentic material increased their vocabulary knowledge and language usage in real situations, increased their cultural awareness, language proficiency and comprehension, met their needs and enhanced their writing styles, and increased their motivation. They preferred reading short stories but also indicated a preference for having materials from magazines, internet sources, books, newspapers, reports etc. They wished that curriculum developers would incorporate the reading of authentic texts in their reading classes. They also wished to be involved in the process of text selection but preferred it to be combined with other activities such as summary writing and discussing the main ideas and also activities that help them improve their critical thinking skills. This present study aims to ask students to choose reading texts of their own interest, from any authentic source (literary or non-literary), summarise it and thereafter, write a response to it.

In general, authenticity in the use of reading texts in EFL classrooms in Saudi Arabia has not received much attention. This shows the gap in literature for more studies in this area in a Saudi context with the focus on how student-selected authentic texts affect their writing. This is closely related to the next section, which explores what a text means and what are some elements of good quality writing. This is also an area related to the present study as we want to find

answers to what effect authentic and self-chosen reading topics have on students' writing performance.

SECTION 3

2.3.1 Text and Textuality

Although to be able to write, a person should have basic levels of phonological, morphological, lexical and syntactical knowledge to construct well-developed sentences, writing is not only about writing grammatically well-structured sentences. In other words, sentences need to be cohesive and show the flow of ideas from one sentence to another, from one part of the text to another so that the reader can grasp the meaning easily. They also need to be coherent i.e. different parts of a text should work together conceptually in a particular way or form. Being cohesive and coherent, the evolving written piece is considered as a discourse which is constantly changing to suit the purpose of the writer and also his/her considerations and accommodations for the readership.

Then, the questions that may arise are what the 'text' means and what constitutes textuality. Text according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) is "any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length that does form a unified whole." It is "a unit of language in use" (p. 1). They believe a text is not like a sentence, but it is a semantic unit, a unit that is not based on the grammatical rules only but on meaning. The linguistic features of a text can give it unity and texture. Having this criterion of textuality in mind, the question is what factors affect the quality of a text.

2.3.2 Text Quality: Text Length

There has been a question on what constitutes a good text. Factors such as lexical complexity, lexical features, syntactic structures, text cohesiveness, text length, and meta-discourse elements have been among those considered as constituents of quality of texts (e.g., Cahyono, 2000; Ferris, 1994; Grant & Ginther, 2000; Jarvis, Grant, Bikowski, & Ferris, 2003; McNamara, Crossley, & McCarthy, 2010; Zhang, 2010). However, in many studies the text length has been the only determining factor (Jarvis et al, 2003) or among those which contributed to or were considered as affecting text quality. Text length is usually measured by the number of words or T-units in compositions. It has been a main part of studies on quality of writing and level of writing proficiency (e.g., Abdel Latif, 2008, 2009; Cahyono, 2000; Crossley &

McCarthy, 2010; Grant & Ginther, 2000; Intraraprawat & Steffensen, 1995; Lavin Crerand, 1993; McNamara et al, 2010; Mellor, 2010; Schneider & Connor, 1990; Tierney et al, 1989; Villanueva, 2008). There have been two strands of research on this issue: those examining the relationship between essay scores and their textual features including text length, and those examining the relationship between language proficiency, especially writing competency, and features of text including its length. Among the first group are studies which used special software tools for their investigation. For example, using Coh-Metrix, a corpus tool which measures linguistic indices, McNamara et al (2010), examined some low and high rated essays to find which linguistic indices could be predictive of essay quality. The linguistic indices were those of cohesion (reference and connectives), syntactical complexity (number of words before verb, sentence structure overlap), diversity of words, and word features (frequency, concreteness, imaginability). They found that three indices that showed prediction of essay quality were syntactic complexity, lexical diversity (measured by the measure of text length and word diversity), and word frequency. They concluded that the high-rated essays had linguistic features that associated with text difficulty and sophistication, one indicator of which was text length. Another example is the study done by Grant and Ginther (2000) in which text length was used besides other linguistic elements (e.g., lexical complexity, lexical features, syntactic structures) to find out whether a computerised tagging program could capture proficiency level of SL learners' essays to determine their proficiency levels. It showed that there was a positive correlation. Other studies without the use of computerised tagging systems have been carried out too and shown that there is a connection between essay rating and essay length (e.g., Intaraprawt, 1995; Kobrin, Deng & Shaw, 2007; Mellor, 2010). Intaraprawt (1995), analysing meta-discourse in good and poor ESL persuasive essays, found that those rated good were the ones with more words, more T- units, and had a density of meta-discourse elements. In another study, Intraprawat and Steffensen (1996) examined argumentative essays of ESL university students and found that essays receiving high marks had used more words, more T-units, and more cohesive ties. Similarly, Mellor (2010) found that the length of the essay had a major role in rating of the essay more than that of word diversity; that is, the longer essays received higher marks. Kobrin et al's study (2007) on SAT essays examined the number of words, paragraphs, and pages, and the type of reasoning. They found that the length of the essay (number of words) had a strong correlation with the essay score. Using topical structure analysis on essays written

for TOEFL test of written English (TWE), Schneider and Connor (1990) measured the mean length of essays in the two groups of low and high-rated essays by counting the T-units and found that the high-rated essays had twice the amount of T-units per essay than the low-rated ones. They found highly significant differences between the high and low-rated essays in terms of their lengths.

The second group of studies looked at the connection between the students' English proficiency level and their text features, including their lengths (e.g., Abdel Latif, 2008, 2009; Cahyono, 2000; Ferris, 1994; Lanauze & Snow, 1989). To find out which of the L1 literacy skills, L2 proficiency level, and instructional contexts had more effect on SL writing proficiency, Lavin Crerand (1993) used length of essay (number of words) as one of the main variables and found L2 students relied more on their L1 literacy skills for writing in L2, and vocabulary and grammatical knowledge played a critical role in L2 writing resulting in producing longer texts. Ferris (1994) examined linguistic elements that can be problematic for ESL/EFL students. She analysed 60 texts, half written by native and half by non-native speakers. The variables were quantitative counts, topical structure analysis and the nature of rhetorical strategies. She found that native speakers outperformed non-native speakers in all aspects. The quantitative analysis of the clauses showed that the native speakers produced more clauses and longer texts and performed better under time constraints. She concluded that longer essays are more likely to show the students' adequate performance in presenting their ideas. In the same vein, Lanauze and Snow (1989) exploring the relationship between first and second language writing skills among Puerto Rican students found that those who had good Spanish and good English and those who had good Spanish but poor English wrote longer and syntactically more complex and more meaningful essays than those who had limited skills in both languages. This finding led them to conclude that the successful students were transferring their L1 literacy skills to their L2. Villanueva (2008) comparing the relationship between writing proficiency and text length found that it was an important consideration, as there was an apparent difference between the text quality of the two types of students; those with low and high language proficiency levels. In yet another study, using Toulmin's model of informal reasoning, Cahyono (2000) found that Indonesian EFL students used rhetorical strategies in their persuasive essays which separated the more proficient students (fourth year of university) from the less proficient ones (first year of university) by the more proficient students using more elaboration on their essays and including

more information mostly drawn from personal experiences or from an authority. Cahyono then concluded that "the ability to use the superstructure of argument, claims and support, charged language, and metaphors is significantly related to elaborate on content, to organize the ideas, and to choose and use vocabulary in essays" (p. 38). Also it was found that the proficiency level determined how strong that co-relation was. This agrees with Ferris' (1994) assertion that writing long texts allows students to do a relatively thorough work since they can include more information and details in their writing.

Some studies on Arab students also produced the same results (Abdel Latif, 2008, 2009). Abdel Latif (2008) examined the relationship between linguistic knowledge, writing affect and writing quality on three text length aspects, namely text quantity, number of sentences, and number of words per sentence in Egyptian EFL student essays. The results showed that linguistic knowledge and writing proficiency influenced text quantity and the number of sentences in the produced text. It also showed that the students' linguistic knowledge was a positive prediction of the number of words and sentences they produced in their essays.

The apparent relationship between the text length and writing quality made some researchers think about an approach that takes this into consideration in language teaching. Chuming (2005), for instance, proposed Length Approach (LA) in teaching SL learners. Using Swain's Output Hypothesis and Krashen's Affective Filter Hypothesis as a basis for his arguments, he reasons that writing is psychologically less threatening than speaking, as it can be an individual activity that with a teacher's positive feedback, could possibly enhance self-concept in the learners. This approach, he explains, requires students not only to write but to write long texts. He brings evidence from Crowhurst (1991, as cited in Chuming, 2005) in which he argues that length influences the text quality and is one of the main indicators of learners' level of writing ability. He further cites Wang's (2003, as cited in Chuming, 2005) argument that only in long texts can writers fully explore the topic in depth. Furthermore, bringing a quote from Larsen-Freeman (1978, p. 440) in which he states that "students with a good writing ability tend to write longer compositions", Chuming advocates his Length Approach saying that although studies show that there is a correlation, and not just a casual one, between the length and quality of L2 writing, it also has the potential to be considered in developing a student's L2 skills. However, he acknowledges that it does not mean that long texts are necessarily better than short

ones but it is a means to an end and not an end by itself (p.17). He further asserts that long compositions have many advantages, one of which is the in depth discussion of ideas (p 17).

What these studies point to, is that there exists a relationship between text length and text quality. This relationship displays that in order to develop their ideas and get their meaning across, learners need to write more, which explains why longer texts usually have features that affect the quality of the texts positively. As being an indicator of quality of writing, the lengths of reader responses to different reading topics will be considered in this study to see if there is any relationship between them. It will also be informative to see how the lengths of responses of these two groups of students with different levels of language proficiency compare with each other.

The literature review so far, was specifically related to the first question of this study: connection of reading and writing, student motivation, reading topics, and assessing quality of student texts. The next section, will review the literature in light of the second question of this study: characteristics of different levels of cognitive involvement and generic structure of student responses.

SECTION 4

The second research question of this study intends to explore the characteristics of student responses in term of both their level of cognitive engagement with the text and their generic structure. The following is a review of literature on each of these notions and a model for assessing the cognitive levels of engagement that is presented.

2.4.1 Ways of Assessing Students' Levels of Thinking in Their Texts

A survey of literature shows that although the terms critical thinking and higher order thinking are notions that educationists advocate and consequently design classroom practices and course objectives to nourish and develop in students, there is not much literature on actually how to assess learners' written texts to explicitly evaluate their cognitive engagement with the reading texts.

To be able to examine how different reading topics affect students' cognitive involvement with the texts as evident in their responses, there is a need to create a model showing different cognitive levels based on students' responses (language). The process of creating a model usually starts with a literature review. In reviewing the literature, two main

strands are seen: a) studies on reader responses which have categorisational schemes for student responses based on the language used in student journals or on the content of reader responses, and b) studies on student reflective journals which is mainly concerned with categorisational schemes showing levels of students' reflection on their experiential learning and professional training situations.

The first type of literature (Al-Mahrooqi 2011a & 2011b; Dekker, 1991; Dreyfuss & Barill, 2005; Hancock, 1993) is on assessing student journals or reader responses to literature (literary texts) and an influential typology used has been that of Squire (1964, as cited in Al-Mahrooqi 2011a & 2011b). The second strand of literature includes studies on assessing the levels of reflection in texts produced by students who were studying in a professional field to become a practitioner. With an exception of a few studies (e.g., Seng, 2004; Sparks-Langer, Simmons, Pasch & Colton, 1990) which looked at the language in reflective journals, the majority of these studies tried to draw a framework or categorisational scheme to measure levels of reflectivity in student journals, essays and interviews (e.g., Dyment & O'Connell, 2010; Jenson & Joy, 2005; Plack, Dricoll, Blissett, McKenna, & Plack, 2005; Plack, Driscoll, Marquez, Cuppernull, Maring, & Greenberg, 2007; Spading & Wilson, 2002; Taggart & Wilson, 2005; Wallman, Lindblad, Hall, Lundmark, & Ring, 2008; Wong, Kember, Chung, & Yan, 1995) .

A review of reader response studies and those on student reflective journals will help to identify common concepts mentioned in these studies, and to incorporate them to create a model for this study that encompasses cognitive levels evidenced in the student responses and the text features that specifically help to manifest these cognitive levels. In the following sections, these two types of literature are discussed.

2.4.1.1 Organisational schemes using reader responses: students' responses to literary texts.

As mentioned earlier, the reader response theory asserts that reader response is a transactional act in which learners are actively making meaning when reading a text, irrespective of whether its focus is on efferent or aesthetic aspect (Rosenblatt, 1978).

In his study, Hancock (1993) classified students' reader responses to literary works into three general categories: personal meaning making, character and plot involvement, and literary criticism. This categorisation does not show the cognitive involvement level but just classifies the texts according to the aspect of the literary work the students focused on in their reading and

writing. In another study, Dekker (1991) categorised students' responses in their reading logs into three categories of 'retelling', 'simple evaluation', and 'elaborated evaluation'.

Dreyfuss and Barilla (2005) studied the types of responses students gave to the task of reading a novel and found that the student responses fell into six categories, as presented in the table below.

Table 2.1

Dreyfuss and Barilla's Categories of Reader Responses

Category of response	Description
1. Summary	Retelling of events from the story
2. Interpretation	Expressing the understanding of an event
3. Personal connection	Relating events and/or characters to one's life/world
4. Literary elements	Discussing characters, themes, plot, problem-solution, climax, setting
5. Opinion	Expression of personal ideas with textual support, experiential support or no support
6. Questioning, wondering and predictions	Questions related to the events or seeking clarification of text

As it is evident, this categorisation scheme is based on features of language used in the responses and the researchers did not refer to them as cognitive levels.

Another study is Al-Mahrooqi's (2011a & 2011b) on Omani EFL students. She analysed their reader responses using Squire's (1964, as cited in Al-Mahrooqi, p. 1563) categories of responses to a literary text (see Table 2.2)

Table 2.2

Squire's Categories of Reader Responses

Category of response	Description
1. Literal judgments	Containing judgments on the story as an artistic work, the reader judges the work's language and artistic value as "good' or "bad" (e.g., "The author's style is good").
2. Interpretational responses	Trying to make meaning of the story but not hypothesising or predicting. The reader attempts to arrive at the text's meaning by exploring the events and characters' actions. It has 9 sub-categories: a. Text-oriented interpretations: interpreting the text without hypothesising, predicting, generalising, questioning etc. b. Misinterpretations: failure in interpretations c. Generalisations: making general statements about common practices among people d. Questioning: questioning characters' motivations but not necessarily looking for an answer e. Inquiring: asking questions and really needing an answer

	f. Hypothesising: hypothesising about what is happening in the story h. Moral and personality judgments: passing judgments on a character's personality or action i. Didactic comments: relying on codes of religious or culture to support their understanding of the text and basis for their judgments j. Prediction: anticipating what is going to happen next based on their own cultural knowledge
3. Narration	A retelling of the story without any interpretation; the reader merely retells the story/event
4. Associated responses	Responding by making a connection between the information/event in the text and his own background and experiences
5. Self-involvement	Containing association between reader's feelings and characters in the story; the reader relates to the way the character feels or behaves with that of his own
6. Prescriptive judgments	Prescribing a course of action for the characters by giving them advice, what they should or shouldn't do
7.Miscellaneous	Responding in a way that doesn't belong to any of the categories above

To the best of my knowledge and as shown above, all literature, to a certain extent, have an analysis of student texts that relate to student responses to literary texts, whether they are novels or short stories. There seems to be a lack of studies on student responses to non-literary texts, something that is the focus of this study. Additionally, as mentioned above, in the studies of reader responses, the researchers mainly focused on the type of responses from the point of language and not the cognitive levels involved in each response.

The following section overviews the second strand of literature which is on reflective journals. It outlines some categorisational schemes for assessing cognitive/reflective levels of student journals of those studying in medical, pharmaceutical, educational and a variety of other professional programs.

2.4.1.2 Organisational schemes for assessing cognitive involvement using reflective journals/essays/interviews.

Reflection has been defined as "an essential skill in being able to re-evaluate old knowledge, and develop and incorporate new knowledge into practice, in order to reach greater competence in practice" (Droege, 2003, as cited in Wallman et al, 2008, p.1). Boud, Keogh and Walker (1985) define reflection as an important activity that humans get involved in to think about their experience, contemplate on it and evaluate it. According to Boud et al, the reflection process consists of feelings and cognition which are interrelated. The cognitive activities include

making inferences, discriminating and associating relationships, and validating assumptions. The way individuals respond to a new experience is greatly affected by their past experience and their perception of the world.

There are diverse but influential models of reflection in the literature. Reflection in its way used in professional fields requires the learners/practitioners to analyse an experience and learn from it by writing about their experience in reflective journals. Student practitioners use reflection journals to think about and develop their practice by challenging the routine practice (Wong et al, 1995). Therefore, their practice is called reflective practice, a process that includes both feelings and thinking. The feelings make the learner respond to the situation at hand and thinking and reflection in this process causes transformative learning (Boud et al, 1985; Mezirow 1990, as cited in Wong et al, 1995).

As said earlier, learning about theories of reflectivity and reviewing related studies can be valuable to this study in order to have an insight into what cognitive levels are and what kind of language is used in each level. However, two things must be remembered: a) this study is on students' reading experience while literature on reflectivity assesses students' reflection on an actual practical experience. b) The reflective process in addition to the element of practice/experience to reflect on has an element of outcome that confirms that new learning and understanding has taken place. These two elements might not be relevant to this study; however, by looking at common core concepts and ideas in a reflective and cognitive process that may be applicable to this study, a model of cognitive levels for reader responses to both literary and non-literary texts can be developed. In the following, we will review the influential models of reflectivity and studies that were conducted using these models. The core elements of cognitive levels that are of relevance to a reader response study such as this will be underlined (refer to Table 3.7, item 5.a, for the use of underlining in this section).

2.4.1.3 Models of reflectivity levels.

One of the major cognitive schemes, which is still referred to and utilised, especially in the field of education, is Bloom's (1956) Taxonomy (as cited in Krathwohl, 2002). In some studies that assessed students' reflective and cognitive levels according to their journal writing, the researchers either used Bloom's Taxonomy of six levels of cognition ('knowledge', 'comprehension', 'application', 'analysis', 'synthesis', 'evaluation') or modified it to suit their study purpose. Others used tests based on it, such as Webb's Florida Taxonomy of Cognitive

Behavior (e.g., Flateby, 2009; Liaw, 2007**;** Plack et al, 2007; Whittington, Stup, Bish, & Allen, 1997). This model classified the cognitive activities from the lower level of knowledge about something to the higher levels of analysis and appraisal. Using this model has assisted the educators as well as researchers to distinguish between the different cognitive processes that are required for or used in performing an action.

However, when it comes to levels of reflectivity, which also include cognitive levels but is more specific on thinking about an actual experience/practice, one of the most influential theorists has been Mezirow. Reflection in Mezirow's belief (1990, as cited in Wong et al, 1995) is not to think, problem-solve or plan for future action based on one's learned knowledge but it involves questioning the content and process in order to make meaning or comprehend the learning experience better. To him, the reflective process brings new knowledge resulting in transformational learning. Table 2.3 presents Mezirow's categories of reflection (1991, as cited in Wallman et al, 2008).

Table 2.3

Mezirow's (1991) Categories of Reflection

Levels of reflection	Description
1. Habitual action	An unconscious act that doesn't require thinking and can be done at the same time as other acts
2. Thoughtful action	Drawing on the prior knowledge but the choice for action might be unconscious or not at all. No question or interpretation is made. The consequences of the act are not considered.
3. Introspection	Thoughts about one's own thoughts and feelings about doing a task. No thought is given or question asked about why one feels or thinks the way he/she does in a situation.
4. Content reflection	Thinking about one's feelings/thoughts/actions during a task. There is a questioning or explanation about how the person feels or thinks the way he/she does.
5. Process reflection	Thinking about one's feelings/thoughts/actions in a situation and how he/she assesses one's performance.
6. Premise reflection (theoretical reflection)	Referring to how a person's knowledge of his/her feelings/thoughts/actions results in providing him/her with a framework to act in different situations, consequences, and alternatives leading to more questions and more reasoning.

Mezirow's model includes 3 categories of reflectors: 'non reflectors' (those not showing evidence of any element of reflection; 'reflectors' (those showing evidence of attending to

feelings, synthesis and association but not showing any changes of perspective; 'critical reflectors' (those showing evidence of *reflectors* but also showing appropriation and change of perspectives.

While Mezirow's six-level reflectivity model considers reflection to exist even in actions done habitually, the model of reflectivity process proposed by Boud et al (1985) has five levels which are similar to levels 2-6 of Mezirow's. Table 2.4 shows these processes and their key elements.

Table 2.4

Boud et al's (1985) Categories of Reflectivity Processes

Reflectivity process	Description
1. Association	Connecting the content to a previously known concept/experience
2. Integration/synthesis	Finding relationships in the context
3. Validation	Evaluation of the ideas and feelings that have resulted
4. Appropriation	Gaining new knowledge and making it one's own
5. Outcomes of reflection	Developing new perspective or changes in behaviour as well as integration, validation, appropriation as outcomes of reflection.

It seems Boud et al (1985) did not consider any reflectivity to exist in doing habitual action. This appears to be consistent with some other reflectivity models mentioned below.

In addition to Mezirow's and Boud et al's models, which have been mostly for those in a health-care field, three main models of reflection for students/practitioners in the field of education have also been developed (e.g., Hatton & Smith, 1995; Valli, 1997; Van Manen, 1977). Table 2.5 shows the three-level reflectivity model developed by Van Manen (1977).

Table 2.5

Van Manen's Reflectivity Model

Levels of reflectivity	Description
1. Technical reflection	Thinking about the appropriateness of means to achieve certain ends, application of theories of learning and principles to one's practice
2. Practical reflection	Examining the means and the ends by questioning the assumptions and the actual results
3.Critical reflection	Moral and ethical issues related to social compassion as well as consideration of the means and the ends

This model has elements of deliberate reflection, whether reflecting on one's own level of knowledge of the field or practices, and critical thinking about one's action in regards to other

members of the society. This latter point, focusing on society, can be said to be a new way of thinking about reflection giving it a more social nature instead of being solely focused on the person (as is the case with the Mezirow's and Boud's models).

An expanded version of this model is Valli's reflectivity model (1997) for student teachers (see Table 2.6), which includes 5 levels:

Table 2.6

Valli's Reflectivity Model

Reflection levels	Description
1. Technical reflection	Thinking about one's practice, checking whether it follows the theory and principles
2. Reflection-in-action	Thinking about one's own unique teaching preferences and situations using one's values, contextual factors, as well as the students' as consideration for a course of action
3. Deliberative reflection	Using one's beliefs, contextual factors, research and advice of colleagues to make a logical decision
4. Personalistic reflection	Thinking about one's personal growth, holistic development of students, and relationship with students
5. Critical reflection	Thinking about social, moral, and political factors affecting the profession and education in general. Issues of social justice and opportunity are of importance.

Although these two models of reflectivity (Valli, 1997; Van Manen, 1977) have common concepts with Mezirow's and Boud et al's models mentioned above, their highest levels of reflectivity, 'critical reflection', emphasises the interconnection that exists between a person and the bigger milieu of social and ethical matters that affect his/her thinking and decision-makings. To them thinking about social compassion and social justice indicates a higher level of thinking in which the person is not only thinking about him/her own growth but about the growth of the whole society.

A language based model of reflectivity, however, is that of Hatton and Smith (1995). Their analysis of educators' written reports showed that their writing could be classified into four groups (see Table 2.7).

Table 2.7

Hatton and Smith's Reflectivity Model

Level of reflectivity evident in writing	Description
1. Descriptive writing	Merely reporting events and not showing any reflection
2. Descriptive reflection	Describe the events and showing some level of interpretation
3. Dialogic reflection	Stepping back, exploring reasons and discussing different views on the subject
4. Critical reflection	Exploring reasons in a broader sense by considering the social, historical, and ethical milieus

This model instead of describing different levels of reflection and what the practitioners (teachers here) think or feel in each level, uses their actual writing to analyse for signs of different levels of reflection. This seems to be a useful way of approaching the subject of reflectivity and is of relevance to the present study.

Some researchers used one of the above typologies which they thought was appropriate for their research purposes without any modifications. For example, Wallman et al (2008) used Mezirow's (1991) taxomony to analyse pharmacy students' reflective journals. However, many others made some adjustments to the models in order to make them suitable for their study needs or used a mixed model (e.g., Minott, 2008; Plack et al, 2005; Plack et al, 2007; Seng, 2004; Sparks-Langer et al, 1990; Wong et al, 1995).

Minott (2008) used Valli's model (1997) to analyse reflective journals of student teachers in an Australian university. However, he found that 'technical reflection' was not present in the journal entries. He therefore omitted it in the model. Plack et al (2005) made their multi-faceted model of reflectivity based on Boud et al's (1985), Mezirow's (1990), and Schon's (1987, as cited in Plack et al, 2005) theories of reflectivity. They used this new model to analyse reflective journals of physiotherapy students and found it to be appropriate for the purpose of their study. However, in another study Plack and some of his other colleagues (Plack et al, 2007) used Bloom's taxonomy to analyse reflective journals of ambulatory paediatrics students. They made modifications in Bloom's six-level cognition category to make a model with three levels (see Table 2.8).

Table 2.8

Plack et al's Reflectivity Model

Level of reflectivity evident in writing	Description
1. Knowledge and comprehension	Simply describing the experience
2. Application and analysis	Analysing the experience from their own view or others' view
3.Synthesis and evaluation	Drawing conclusion and hypothesised the future action

They believed that using Bloom's modified taxonomy was helpful and easily applicable and understandable by coders. We can see that while this model is similar to that of Hatton and Smith (1995), it is more focused on the person and does not consider the broader social or ethical matters (critical reflection).

Yet, in another study on levels of reflectivity, Wong et al (1995) used Boud et al's (1985) and Mezirow's (1990) theories and made a mixed model to analyse reflective journals of nursing students' studying in a university in Hong Kong.

So far, most of these reflective journal studies have made their typology based on looking at reflection mostly from the cognitive process aspect and not the language aspect. That is, their focus was on the practice (an event in the workplace) and the reflection about it. However, Sparks-Langer et al (1990) and Seng (2004), examining reflective journals of student teachers, developed a model that mentions features of language for each cognitive/reflective level. Their model was based mainly on Van Manen's (1977) study and they called it 'The Framework for Reflective Pedagogical Thinking'. They believed that by analysing student teachers' language (through the interviews/journal entries) they were able to know whether students could use teaching principles and concepts in their classrooms. Their framework has seven levels as presented in the table below.

Table 2.9

Sparks-Langer et al's Reflectivity Model

Level of reflectivity evident in writing	Description
1	No descriptive language
2	Simple, layperson description
3	Events labelled with appropriate terms

4	Explanation with traditional or personal preference used as the rationale
5	Explanation with principles/theory used as the rationale
6	Explanation with principles/theory used as the rationale and consideration of contextual factors
7	Explanation with consideration of ethical/moral/ political issues

Levels 1-6 are cognitive reflection but level 7 is critical reflection. They did not label the cognitive levels. This model although based on Van Menan's model (1977) can be said to be an expanded version of Hatton and Smith's (1995) model mentioned earlier. It allows other forms of language which are not 'describing' or 'explaining' to be part of the reflection (level 1).

Another model of reflectivity with a focus on language belonged to Seng (2004) who planned to use Sparks-Langer et al's model to analyse student teachers' reflective journals but found that this framework was most appropriate for analysing interview scripts. He modified this framework and added a cognitive element to the model. The modified framework has six categories as presented below.

Table 2.10

Seng's Reflectivity Model (in Seng, 2004, p. 4)

Level of reflectivity evident in reports	Description
1. Non-judgmental report	Description/narration of events or supervisors' comments
2. Judgmental report	Description of events/problems/supervisors' comments, personal suggestion for future
3. Description	Explanation of events/problems, personal suggestion for future actions with tradition or personal preference given as a reason or justification
4. Description	Explanation with principles or theory as reason/justification
5. Description	Explanation with principles/theory and consideration of conceptual factors as reason or justification
6. Description	Explanation with consideration of ethical/moral/political issues

As shown above and as Dyment and O'Connell (2010) in their study of reviewing reflective journal studies rightly pointed out, there has not been a unified model of assessing reflection that all researchers have used. On the contrary, researchers used different models or

created their own models to assess student journals to determine the level of their thinking or level of reflectivity.

The models discussed above have looked at reflection from different perspectives and therefore are different in their complexity, with some models having only three levels and some having more up to seven. Each model has a range of standards and criteria for each level of reflectivity. Table 2.11 shows the above mentioned models.

Table 2.11

A Comparative View of Different Taxonomies for Evaluating Levels of Reflectivity

THEOR-IST(S)	Van Manen (1977)	Valli (1997)	Van Manen (1977)	Hatton & Smith (1995)	Modified Sparks-Langer et al's model (1990)	Mezirow (1991)	Boud et al (1985)	Bloom's modified 3- level model (1956)	Mezirow (1990)
RE-SEARCHERS	Sparks-Langer et al (1990)	Minott (2008)	Sparks-Langer et al (1990)	Hatton & Smith (1995)	Seng (2004)	Wallman et al (2008)	Wong et al (1995)	Plack et al (2005)	Wong et al (1995)
LEVELS OF THINK-ING Lowest ↓ Highest	1) Tech-nical (basic facts, lack of enough schema)	1) Tech-nical (applying research into practice)	1) No descriptive language (no description provided)	1)Descrip-tive writing (reports events, not reflective)	1) Non-judgmental report/ narration of events/ describing	1) Habitual action, act without thought	1) Associ-ation, connects the content to prior known concept/ experi-ence	1) Know-ledge & compre-hension	1) Non-reflection
			2) Simple description					2) Applica-tion & analysis	2) Reflection
			3) Events labelled with appropriate pedagogical terms		2) Judgmental/ descriptive report, gives suggestions for action with no justification	2)Thoughtful action, use of knowledge & options unconscious-ly			
	2) Con-textual, linking theory into practice at hand, more schema	2) Reflect in/on practice (seeing context)	4) Explain with tradition or personal preferences as the rationale	2)Descrip-tive reflection, reasons based on personal judgment	3) Description of personal preferences given as reason	3) Introspection, thought s about one's thoughts & feelings about a task	2) Integration /synthesis, finding links in the context	3) Synthe-sis & evalu-ation	3) Critical reflection
		3) Delib-erate reflection (assess-ing various views)	5) Explain with principle or theory as the rationale	3) Dialogic reflection (form a discourse with one's self by exploring possible reasons	4) Description/ explanation with principle or theory, as reason/ justification of rationale	4) Content reflection, what one perceives/ thinks/feels or acts while doing tasks	3) Validation, evaluation of the ideas		
		4) Person-alistic							

		reflection							
	3) Critical (seeing broader social/ political issues)	5) Critical reflection (social/political issues come into the picture)	6)Explain with principle/ theory & seeing contextual factors		5) Description with principle/ theory, considering contextual factors	5) Process reflection, on the performance & its efficiency	4) Appropri-ation, gaining new know-ledge		
			7) Explain, considering ethical, moral, & political issues	4) Critical Reflection (seeing broader contexts)	6) Description/ explanation, considering ethical, moral & political issues	6) Premise reflection, analysis of the situation	5) Outcomes of reflection		

As can be seen in this table, I tried to show the levels of each model that has common concept/theme with the levels of other models to highlight the overlapping or encompassing ideas. For example, level 1 of Van Manen's model, ' technical reflection', resonates with level 1 of Vallie's model, 'technical', since in both of them, direct application of theory to practice without any other consideration is the main consideration. Level 2 of Van Manen, 'contextual', can encompass levels 2, 3 and 4 of Vallie's as 'reflective in/on practice', 'deliberate reflection', viewing other's point of views, and 'personalistic reflection' can all be considered as contextual elements in reflecting on an experience. Van Manen's level 3 'critical' can match level 5 of Vallie's, 'critical reflection', since both of these levels focus on reflection that involves elements of broader social, political, and ethical issues. Another example is reflection levels proposed by Boud et al (1985), Mezirow (1990), and cognitive levels of Bloom. Level 1 of Boud et al's model, 'association' or connecting the new knowledge to the previous knowledge, corresponds to Bloom's 'knowledge and comprehension', and 'application and analysis' because in 'association' one uses one's 'knowledge' that already exists to 'comprehend' the new information and connect it to previously learned information. In this process, one might show one's comprehension by 'applying' the new information to different situations. This application needs 'analysis' of the situation as well. The level 1 of Boud et al and Bloom's first 4 levels overlap with Mezirow' levels 1 and 2, 'non-reflection' and 'reflection', since 'knowledge' and 'comprehension' can be categorised as non-reflection and 'applying' and 'analysis' are acts that usually need a deeper understanding and reflectivity. Boud et al's reflective levels 2-5, 'integration', 'validation', 'appropriation' and 'outcomes of reflection', seem to correspond to Bloom's cognitive levels 5 and 6, 'synthesis' and 'evaluation', and Mezirow's reflective level 3,

'critical reflection'. The core concepts referred to in all these models not only require a deeper understanding of the experience/event/information but also seeing its relationship to other issues, putting different parts of knowledge together, gaining a new understanding and evaluating them. The next section will explain the framework that this study will use to assess students' levels of thinking in their responses.

2.4.2 A Model or Framework to Evaluate Levels of Thinking in Reader Response Journals

Some researchers are in favour of using predetermined categories for the analysis of data since in their view, this will provide the researchers with a direction to what they should be looking for in the data (e.g., Powell & Renner, 2003, as cited in Minott, 2008). For this study, I needed to develop a model that could categorise students' written responses to texts that are mainly non-literary and to evaluate the level of thinking that is present in each type of response.

Although the categorisational schemes that have been developed to determine types of responses students give to literary texts (reader responses) could be useful for this study, they could not be wholly adopted since the students in this study are not given any literary text(s) to read, unlike what is done in reader response studies, but they are asked to choose and read any text that interests them. Therefore, I tried to look at the four reader response typologies mentioned above (in Section 2.4.1.1) to derive a model that has the core elements mentioned in all of them and could be applicable to this study. Table 2.12 shows these typologies with the common elements being <u>underlined</u> (refer to Table 3.7, item 5.a, for the use of underlining henceforth).

Table 2.12

Reader Response Typologies and Their Common Elements

Reader response studies → / Types of responses ↓	Squire (1964) used in Al Mahrooqi (2011a, 2011b)	Dreyfus and Barill (2005)	Hancock (1993)	Dekker (1991)
1	<u>Literal judgments</u>, judgments on the story as an artistic work	Summary, <u>retelling of events</u>	<u>Personal meaning making</u>	<u>Retelling</u>
2	<u>Interpretational responses</u>, making meaning of the story but not hypothesizing or predicting	<u>Interpretation</u>, expressing understanding of an event	Character and plot involvement	<u>Simple evaluation</u>
3	Narration, <u>retelling of the story</u> without any interpretation	<u>Personal connection</u>, relating	<u>Literary criticism</u>	<u>Elaborated</u>

		events/characters to one's life/world	evaluation
4	Associated responses, making a connection between the information in the text and one's own background and experiences	Literary elements, commenting on the character/ themes	
5	Self-involvement, association between reader's feelings and story characters	Opinion, expression of personal ideas with/without textual/experiential support	
6	Prescriptive judgments, prescribing a course of action	Questioning, wondering and predictions	
7	Miscellaneous, unrelated responses		

It seems that Squire's typology is more comprehensive in presenting different types of responses and can encompass elements of other typologies; however, it is not based on the level of cognitive difficulty but only on the language of the text. For example, 'narration' is after 'interpretational responses' while narrating requires less cognitive effort than interpretation. 'Narration' corresponds to 'knowledge' while 'interpretation' corresponds to 'comprehension' in Bloom's taxonomy.

Therefore, to make it more appropriate for this study and to consider a matching cognitive level for each type of response, I decided to merge some responses that require the same cognitive level together. This resulted in having four main types of responses: *narrational and literal judgment responses* (no evidence of reasoning is present), *interpretational and basic evaluation* (some evidence of reasoning is present), *self and other involvement responses* (*other* can be a specific group of people), and *prescriptive judgment* (seeing the bigger picture) (in relation to the use of italics of the notions henceforth, see Table 3.7, item 3.b). Rationale for merging 'interpretational' and 'associated responses' is that in both, there is an interpretational element and finding a relation between the content with what one already knows about things (whether factual or experiential). Also, there is some degree of judgment on which pieces go together in order to make the content meaningful. It is different from *narration and literal judgment* in that it is not a mere retelling of the content or just passing a judgment without justifying it, but the reader shows some degrees of analytical ability. I describe this as *interpretational and basic evaluation responses*. 'Self-involvement responses' show the reader's personal involvement with the content, whether experientially or emotionally. However, I

modified type three and called it *self and other involvement*, to cater for the responses that students give by connecting the content to other people besides themselves because these responses show that the readers are not merely interpreting the information by looking at the textual information but that they are relating it to themselves and others. In other words, they are trying to see the relation of the content not only to the ideas expressed in the text but also to a specific group of people whether that be themselves or others. For the fourth type, *prescriptive judgment*, I would like to describe it as a type of response that sees the bigger picture and pays attention to social, political, and ethical issues, because to be able to prescribe a course of action and make the judgment one must consider other underlying, relevant issues about the topic and not only rely on the textual information. By looking at the data, student responses, I noticed that Squire's type seven responses, 'miscellaneous', was not applicable to this study; thus, I omitted it from the response types.

To determine the level of students' cognitive involvement with the reading texts, through scrutinising the models of assessing reflective journals mentioned above (in Sections 2.4.1.2 and 2.4.1.3), I was able to find some common concepts that have been referred to and were the basis for categorisational schemes. The general movement of cognitive levels seems to be from a mere reporting, describing and retelling of the event or situation to some analysis and interpretations, relating it to oneself and others, and finally relating it to broader social, political, ethical issues.

It seems a cognitive/reflective model that best suits this study and encompasses the common core concepts of other taxonomies is that of Hatton and Smith (1995). Hatton and Smith's taxonomy includes: 'descriptive writing', 'descriptive reflectivity', 'dialogic reflection', and 'critical reflection'. To emphasise the text and not the student, I used Mezirow's (1990, as cited in Wong et al, 1995) taxonomy of 'quality of reflectivity' which has 3 levels: 'non-reflection', 'reflection', and 'critical reflection', but I divided 'reflection' to include *moderate reflection* and *high reflection* in order for it to correspond to the types of responses and cognitive/reflectivity levels. Table 2.13 shows the model which will be used in this study.

Table 2.13

A New Model to Categorise Student Responses according to Different Levels of Cognitive Engagement

Categories of Responses	*Description*	Levels of thinking	Types of texts
1 .Narrating and literal judgment (no evidence of reasoning is seen)	*The reader-writer narrates, records, reports, describes, re-tells the reading texts without any interpretation or analysis. The reader-writer might not even have a complete understanding of what she/he has read and even if he/she makes any judgment it is not qualified (no reason given)*	Descriptive writing (merely reporting events and not showing any reflection)	Non-reflection
2. Interpretative and basic evaluation (evidence of some reasoning is seen)	*The reader-writer interprets and does simple analysing of the facts/opinion/content of the reading text. The reader-writer might have a holistic judgment of the quality of the reading text with bringing simple reasons/ justifications for it.*	Descriptive reflection (describing the events and show some level of interpretation)	Moderate reflection
3. Self and other involvement (other can be a person or a group of people)	*The reader-writer tries to relate the content to oneself or significant others in his/her family/community.*	Dialogic reflection (stepping back, exploring reasons and discussing different views on the subject)	High reflection
4. Prescriptive judgment/seeing the bigger picture	*The reader-writer tries to connect the content (facts/opinion/ feelings) of the text to some broader underlying social, political, economic, and ethical issues.*	Critical reflection (exploring reasons in a broader sense by considering the social, historical, and ethical milieus)	Critical reflection

The column Categories of Responses in this model shows types of student responses according to the language used in their texts, column Levels of Thinking shows the cognitive/reflection level matching each type of response, and column Types of Text shows the quality of the text overall from the point of reflectivity.

Now that the model for addressing the research question two of this study has been developed and explained, I will turn to the second part of the question which concerns the generic structure of the student responses. This necessitates reviewing the literature on genres and genre analysis, which will be the topics of the next section.

SECTION 5

2.5.1 Genre: The Theoretical Framework

To be able to investigate and analyse the generic structure of student responses (research question two), we need to review theories of genre and related studies. In what follows, different issues of importance for a genre study and the approach appropriate for genre analysis in this study are discussed.

2.5.1.1 Genre theory.

The word genre is a French word and means kind and type. Traditionally, it has been mainly used for literary works (poetry, novel,…), but Brahmin, a Russian researcher, extended this concept to non-literary works such as advertisements, newspapers and others (as cited in Ren, 2010). By tradition, genres have been defined as having particular conventions of contexts and form shared by the texts belonging to any given genre (Chandler, 1997).

Today, however, other definitions of genre have been presented. Genres are now defined as ways to recognise, respond to, act meaningfully in, and assist in producing recurrent situations (Dawarshi & Reiff, 2010). Viewing genres with this lens, they are understood "as forms of cultural knowledge that conceptually frame and mediate how we understand and typically act within various situations. This view recognises genres as both organising and generating kinds of texts and social actions in complex, dynamic relation to one another" (Dawarshi & Reiff, 2010, p. 4).

Although there have been different traditions to genre studies (i.e. Australian Research Tradition, New Rhetoricians, and English for Specific Purposes [ESP]), the ESP tradition is the relevant approach to this study, as this has been used in analysis of academic texts (e.g., Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990). It is a pragmatic approach addressing specific needs of learners and considering the communicative purpose, context, events, and the discourse community. Swales (1990) stipulates that a genre "comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes" (1990, p. 58). To him, genres as linguistic and rhetoric devices communicate something to someone in a specific setting and for some specific aims. Some relate the concept of genre to that of schema theory by arguing that as schema, a mental framework helping one make sense of everyday events, genres help one to make sense of texts and therefore they are like textual schemata (Chandler, 1997; Hyland, 1990). Genres thus are not just texts but facilitators between texts, text makers, and text readers. The form and

properties of genres facilitate reader comprehension and interpretation of the texts. This is what Swales' definition of genre relies on. This is an important understanding of genre and relevant to this study as to know how the EFL students participating in this study perceived the purpose of a reader response text to be and how they tried to achieve that purpose by producing a text which would make sense to them and to the reader.

2.5.2 Genre Analysis

Unlike some traditional approaches (e.g., Systemic Functional Language) that consider genres as being confined to certain linguistic conventions, many (e.g., Bhatia, 1993; Gledhill, as cited in Kress, 1988; Swales, 1990) argue that there are no strict rules for inclusion or exclusion of texts in a genre because genres are not discreet systems that have a fixed number of items. That is, if we say a certain genre has specific features, it does not mean that those features are not seen or shared in other genres or are unique to this genre only, but that those features have more prominence and their combination and functions make this genre to be distinctive (Neale, 1980, as cited in Chandler, 1997). Neale (1980) believes that genres are instances of repetition and difference. The concept of difference facilitates understanding of the fact that some genres are more flexible, i.e. more open-ended in their properties with looser boundaries (Chandler,1997). Similarly, Swales (1990) using the concept of 'prototypicality' explains texts of a genre can be said to be more typical members of a genre than others. Hence, features of a text make it be prototypical of a specific genre.

While traditionally genres were considered to have a fixed form, the new interpretations of genre stress that genres have dynamic forms and function. Todorov (as cited in Swales, 1990) asserts that a new genre is usually a changed or a combined version of one or several old genres. Some even suggest that there is no text that does not belong to any genre because there is no genreless text; that is, every text has features and functions of one or several genres (Derrida, as cited in Chandler, 1997). Like Todorov, Derrida (2000, as cited in Dawarshi & Reiff, 2010) argues that texts cannot be said to be owned by a genre, like what is in a categorical relation, rather 'participate' in a genre or several genres at the same time.

Hasan (1989, as cited in Ren, 2010), a pioneer in the Sydney School (Systemic Functional Language), defined genre as a 'type of discourse' for analysing texts and theorised that genres have a generic structure potential (GSP). To her, each genre has a GSP which consists of obligatory, optional and recursive components. The obligatory component defines a

genre, but the function of optional components cause variations in texts belonging to a specific genre. This explanation can be used to explicate the different forms of texts one might have considered to belong to one particular genre. The obligatory elements account for similarity of the texts in a genre, while different choices of optional elements in the text account for the differences.

In the ESP tradition, because the communicative purpose is the rationale for existence of a genre, analysis of genres has been to identify the purpose of the genre in the discourse community, to examine the text organisation (schematic structure) by the use of concepts called moves and steps, and to examine textual and linguistic features used in the moves and steps. McCarthy (1991, as cited in Murdoch, 2000) believes that readers can recognise textual patterns when they process a text. Some of these patterns may occur repeatedly in the text. He also says that "one point about pattern is that they are of no fixed size in terms of number of sentences or paragraphs contained in them" (p. 2). Since genre analysis "focuses on the analysis of regularities of structure that distinguishes one type of text from another type" (Lieungnapar & Todd, 2011, p.1), the purpose of genre analysis is then defined as to identify the moves, their sequences and their linguistic characteristics.

Swales (1990) defines genres as "distinct forms of discourse which have structure, style, content, and specific audience" in common and are used by specific discourse community for performing specific communicative purposes through social-rhetorical medium of writing. He uses the term 'move' to refer to a functional unit in a text which is based on an identifiable purpose. Moves can have different lengths and sizes based on the overall communicative purpose of the genre but should "contain at least one proposition" (Connor & Mauranen, 1999, as cited in Ding, 2007, p. 370).

On how to identify a text's genre, Swales believes that "exemplars or instances of genres vary in their prototypicality" (1990, p. 49), which means that a text can be defined to belong to a genre based on family resemblance. "This family resemblance is determined by the communicative purpose that the genre prototype is based on. Following this, other properties such as form, structure and audience expectations operate to identify the extent to which an exemplar is prototypical of a particular genre" (Dawarshi & Reiff, 2010, p. 46). Paltridge (1997, as cited in Dawarshi & Reiff, 2010) uses the same notion of prototype to account for how people categorise objects. He agrees with Swales in that prototype or family resemblance help to

categorise texts according to their structure and lexico-grammatical patterns related to a genre prototype. He argues that while some texts have close resemblance to their genre prototype, others might be on the boundaries of different prototypes like the case with mixed genres.

Flowerdew (2000) explains this notion further by saying that prototypical structures exist but they are not rigid, rather the concept of genre allows for variation in the prototypical structure as well as the lexico-grammatical choices since cultures and ideologies affect the communicative purposes and in turn affect the structure of a genre. In the same vein, Bhatia (1993) distinguishes 3 interrelated concepts in genre analysis: communicative purposes, rhetorical strategies and moves. Communicative purposes are the determining factor for distinguishing a genre from others and control the choice of moves for achieving these purposes. Rhetorical strategies are mainly linguistic in nature and depend on the writer's choice (e.g., use of personal pronouns). Moves are discriminative elements that set different genres apart. If moves vary significantly in a genre, then they are not the same genre while rhetorical strategies depend on the writer's choices and are non-discriminative; they do not change or vary the nature of a genre.

All these definitions and properties of genres can assist us in examining the generic structure of reader responses. The questions that one might ask are whether reader response has a rigid or a flexible structure and what its constituting moves and steps are. These are the questions that the current research aims to investigate.

2.5.3 Genre Studies

Since 90s, after the publication of Swales' seminal work (1990) on genre analysis in which he identified different moves in the research article introductions and introduced the Creating A Research Space (CARS) model, many researchers have used Swales' approach in genre analysis for identifying moves in other academic and non-academic genres. It is a top-down approach in which the focus is on units of meaning and their functions. A text is viewed as a sequence of moves and each move is considered to be performing a specific communicative function. The overall structure of discourse is described according to the moves (and steps) that have been identified in it. Bhatia (1997, answering a review article on Bhatia's 1993 work, published in *Hermes, Journal of linguistics* supports Swales' (1990) model of genre analysis and explains that although text-internal purposes factor can help in identification of communicative purposes, depending on them solely, could give misleading insights. Reference to context (text-

external) is necessary to determine the discourse value of a linguistic form. Although 'moves' are units of communicative purpose, 'steps' are as strategies that can realise a move. Moves are discriminatory and affect the nature of genre but steps are non-discriminatory (Bhatia, 1997).

Some of the academic genres that have been examined using Swales' approach include research articles (Nwogu, 1997); different sections of research articles such as abstracts (Bhatia, 1993; Zhen-ye, 2008), introduction (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1990), discussion (Swales, 1990), introductions of PhD dissertation (Gecikli, 2013), results and discussions of PhD dissertations (John, 2007); conference abstracts (Menezes, 2013); call for conference papers (Mohammadi, Hekmatshoar Tabari, & Hekmatshoar Tabari, 2013); grant proposals (Connor & Mauranen, 1999; Feng & Shi, 2004; Swales, 1990); report projects (Flowerdew, 2000); personal statements in application letters (Ding, 2007); journal descriptions (Hyland &Tse, 2009; Lieungnapar & Todd, 2011)); book preface (Mohsenzadeh,2013); book reviews (Cacchiani, 2007; Motta-Roth, 1998; Salmani Nodoshan & Montazeran, 2012); academic journal book reviews (Suarez & Moreno, 2006); teacher feedback (Mirandor, 2000); argumentative essays (Hyland, 1990; Yang, 2009); introductions and conclusions of argumentative essays (Afful, 2010; Henry & Roseberry, 1997; Kusel, 1992); and student research paper conclusions (Hüttner, 2010). Some non-academic genres studied include legal documents (Bhatia, 1993), job applications (Bhatia, 1993; Crossley, 2008); sale promotion letters (Bhatia, 1993), birthmother letters (Upton & Cohn, 2009), patient information leaflets (Ghaemi & Sheibani , 2014); newspaper editorials (Katajamaki & Koskela, 2006), and book blurbs (Cacchiani, 2007). The table (A1) in Appendix A is a summary of these studies and the number of moves (without the steps) that were identified in the genre examined.

Some of these studies have been done to investigate the role of discipline, linguistic backgrounds, and language proficiency levels on a specific genre. To the best of my knowledge, there is a gap in literature on genre of reader responses. Even some big-scale studies (e.g., Gardner & Nesi, 2013) did not have this type of assignment in their data. Gardner and Nesi (2013) had a comprehensive study based on the British Academic Writing English corpus (BAWE), which is based on samples of student writing in different disciplines. The purpose of their study was to develop a genre family model which could show different academic assignment groupings based on their purposes. They categorised the assignments under 13 super-genres. However, there was no reader response assignment included in this corpus or in their categorisation.

Lack of studies on reader response genre might be explained by Hüttner's (2010) arguments that EAP is a genre that has variety of genres that belong to 'genre-colonies' based on their purposes. She acknowledges that the corpus studies are usually done on public corpora and concludes that this might be a reason that some genres are under-represented (e.g., letter of credit in the business corpus), while others are over-represented (e.g., research articles, abstracts etc.). The fact of under-representation of some genres can be better explained by the notion of 'occluded genres' that Swales (1990) employed to refer to genres that are not public because they are not easily attainable. Therefore, we can conclude that to some extent student texts can be considered as 'occluded' genres as they are more difficult to obtain and sort than public ones such as research papers or book reviews.

A helpful concept to consider for identifying and classifying a genre is the notion of 'super-genre' used by Bhatia (1997). Bhatia reiterates his arguments in his earlier work (1993) on how two different genres (sale promotion letters and job applications) can belong to the same genre (promotional genre) and how two similar genres (research article abstracts and research article introduction) can be different genres based on their communicative purposes. He then argues that we can have a concept of genre as having a hierarchy: super-genres, genres, and sub-genres. Super-genres can include promotional genres, reporting genres, academic genres, introducing genres. Each one of these can have its own "colonies of several related genres" (1997, p. 232). Sub-genres are those genres that share the same communicative purpose with the genre but differ in their contextual factors (medium, audience, tenor,..). He believes that the concept of genre having 3 layers gives it versatility, where negotiations in the production and process of a genre are facilitated.

Having these notions in mind, we can now consider the purpose of reader responses so as to determine which super-genre it belongs to. The main communicative purpose of a reader response is to give the opinion of a reader on a text, whether the text is literary or non-literary. As a result, it is logical to conclude that the purposeful implementation of a reader response task is to develop students' appreciation of literature (aesthetic aspect) as well as develop their cognitive skills (efferent aspect) by showing their comprehension, analysis, synthesis, application and evaluation. These can be seen in the opinion super-genre. Therefore, findings of studies on this type of genre can be helpful to this study.

A related line of research is those done on student essays. Henry and Roseberry (1997) define essay as a genre that can be said to have a purpose of presenting an 'opinion', and defending or explaining it. This aligns with Brufee's (1980, as cited in Henry & Roseberry, 1997, p. 479) definition of the aim of essays, that of presenting a point of view on an issue and defending or explaining it. To him, an expository essay has three parts: introduction, a unifying idea, and a defence and explanation. This definition can include many texts such as newspaper editorials, case studies and others. Although this definition of the essay has a similar communicative purpose as that of a reader response, the difference is that essays are widely used in most disciplines, whereas the reader response task is usually used in a literature or language class. In both of them, the participants are the teacher and the students. However, in the reader response task, the texts are usually selected by the teachers and students are usually instructed to answer some questions about the text (prompts) or as in this study to have their response to a text (no questions are set on the text). The essay task, on the other hand, might be based on the reading of the course material or simply requiring students to write on a writing prompt given by the teachers (especially in language classes). However, for the purpose of this study and keeping in mind the differences of these two genres, findings of the studies on essay writing as well as those belonging to opinion super-genre (e.g., book reviews, book blurbs, editorials) will be helpful in analysis of the genre of reader responses here.

2.5.4 Reader Response Genre and Relevant Literature

As mentioned above, for determining the generic structure of reader responses, I decided to explore two strands of literature: those on opinion genres and those on student essay studies. Based on the explanations above, it is reasonable to assume that being based on opinion, reader response genre falls under the opinion super-genre which has colonies of other genres (Bhatia, 1997). Mugumya (2013) explains that opinion genres in media include opinions, comments or commentary articles, reviews, editorials and others. In this genre, the author offers subjective interpretations of a topic mainly realised by the use of explicit value judgment, aesthetic evaluation, or theories of causal relations (White, 1997, as cited in Mugumya, 2013, p. 45). We can also include genres such as book reviews and book blurbs that are also opinion-based but have different communicative purposes from the reader responses'. However, as a starting point it is informative to have a quick overview of literature on these genres (e.g., Cacchiani, 2007; Katajamaki & Koskela, 2006; Motta-Roth,1998; Salmani Nodoshan & Montazeran, 2012;

Suarez & Moreno, 2006) to know more about their rhetorical moves and functions in order to have a better understanding of genres of this type. Table 2.14 is a summary such studies on some types of opinion genres and their moves.

Table 2.14

A Summary of Moves in Some Opinion-based Genres

Genres→	Newspaper editorials	Comment articles	Book reviews	Book blurbs
Researcher(s) → Moves↓	Katajamaki & Koskela (2006)	Ledema et al (1994, as cited in Mugumya, 2013)	Salmani Nodoshan & Montazeran (2012); Cacchiani (2007); *Motta-Roth (1998); Suarez & Moreno (2006)	Cacchiani (2007)
1	introduction *(having a critical view of a subject)*	Orientation (*thesis*)	Identification *(issue, title, domain, section, title of book, author ….)*	Identification *(title, author, publisher,…)*
2	Intermediate *(explaining the consequence of the subject (two steps: 1.examples/reasons, 2.solution*	Argument	Introducing the book *(providing initial evaluations of the book, identifying literary (sub-genre), summarizing highlighting part of the book (content/characters)*	Establishing credentials *(author's track record)*
3	Coda (closing) *can have two steps (1. conclusion, 2. moral)*	Conclusion (*a restatement of the thesis*)	Author's track record *(awards, achievements,…)*	Highlighting parts of the book *(content/ characters), appraising the book/style, establishing credentials, targeting market)*
4			Evaluating the book *(praising book/highlighting styles, criticizing the book)*	Appraising the book *(quotations from reviewers, highlighting style, targeting market,..)*
5			Picture *(photo, caption)*/ Postscript *(Motta-Roth's (1998) model lacks this move)	

As can be seen, all these genres have some aspects of appraisal, whether it is for information producing or persuasion and marketing purposes. Some of the moves (e.g., introduction of the content, evaluation of the content or writer style) are expected to be seen in the reader response genre but some others (e.g., establishing writer credentials, quotations from

reviewers, targeting market) do not seem to be as a part of communicative purpose of reader responses.

Similarly, use of the literature on essay studies (Afful, 2010; Henry & Roseberry; Hyland, 1990; Kusel, 1992; Liu, 2015; Yang, 2009) helps in better interpretation of my data as they are academic genres, written by students, and show students' opinion or understanding of an issue or topic, the same elements that are seen in reader responses. Table 2.15 shows a summary of these studies:

Table 2.15

Summary of Some Studies on Essays and Their Rhetorical Moves

Writer	Participants/sample size	Genre	Purpose	Moves/steps
Liu (2015)	184 samples of Chinese EFL students (used Hyland's model)	Conclusion of essays (argumentative and analysing reasons)	Effects of L1 rhetorical transfer or use of writing strategies on L2 writing	3 steps: Affirmation, Consolidation, and Close
Hyland (1990)	10 top essays of EFL/ESL students	Argumentative essays	Structure and moves in argumentative essays	- 5 steps in Introduction (Thesis): The gambit, Informing moves, (definitions, descriptions, or 'straw-man' arguments), the preposition, an evaluation, and the marker - 4 steps in Argument - 4 steps in Conclusion (Marker, Consolidation, Affirmation, Close)
Kusel (1992)	50 essays, NSs in 5 disciplines (revised Swales' model and used it for introduction section)	Argumentative essays' opening and closing	The effect of disciplines on the openings and closings of essays	-3 main moves in the Introduction: Topic Background, Claiming Centrality, Purpose or aims, Indicating Route -3 moves in the Conclusion: Internal Outcomes, External Outcomes, Ground covered
Henry & Roseberry (1997)	40 essays from different genres (newspaper, journals, essay books…)	Introductions and conclusions of essays of different genres	Moves in these two sections of essays and their linguistic characteristics	-3 steps in the Introduction: Introducing the Topic (IT), Narrowing the Focus (NF),Stating the Central Idea (CI) -2 steps in the Conclusion Commitment to the Central Idea (CI), Expanding on the CI (EX)

Afful (2010)	120 essays of EFL students studying in two disciplines (English and Sociology)	Introductions of examination essays	Number of steps in the introductions and the effect of discipline on moves	3 steps in the Introduction: Contextualising issues raised in the prompt, Engaging closely with issues of concern, Previewing the structure of the essay
Rosenwasser and Stephen (2011, as cited in Liu, 2015)		Essay writing		3 moves in the conclusion: Revisiting the beginning of the essay, Pursuing implications, Identifying limitations

By having reviewed the literature above and having an in-depth examination of the data, we will be able to see whether reader responses can be considered as a genre and what moves and possible steps are involved in this genre. These will be discussed in the Findings and Discussion Chapter.

To investigate the third question of this study (use of personal pronouns for self-representation and reader engagement and their rhetorical functions), an understanding of the usages and functions of personal pronouns is necessary. The following section is a review of literature on the use of personal pronouns, which will be informative and assist in doing the discourse analysis in this study.

SECTION 6

2.6.1 Theories of Academic Writing and the Uses and Functions of Personal Pronouns

As mentioned earlier, writing is a social act. Writers attempt to undertake a communicative purpose in discourse to relate to readers in order to relay their message and present their arguments; as such, they do not write in a vacuum and are not detached from the outside world (Chang, 2014; Hyland, 2005). Indeed, writers use the conventions created and observed by their discourse community to display their identity in their writing and involve the readers in their argument. This latter aspect makes the texts have a dialogic nature. It means, on the one hand the writer attempts to adopt a position on a certain issue and subsequently shows his presence. On the other hand, he tries to get the readers involved in the discourse.

Writer presence in the text has brought with it a focus on an important issue, that of writer identity and the different roles that writers may take on in the course of writing. Hyland asserts that although a text is a shared journey of discovery for both the reader and the writer, the writer is the one who leads the way (2001, p. 560). Generally, study of identity has been viewed

from a number of perspectives: 'individualistic view', 'social view' and 'personal-social view' (Lopez, 2012). The last view, being more common now, emphasises both the writer and the social context of writing.

In literature, we find two main strands of research on writer presence and writer identity; that of Ivanič and her colleagues and other researchers following their framework and that of Hyland and those using his framework. The following discusses the concepts in each of these strands and will show that these two strands have many concepts in common and could help in analysing the student responses in this study.

Ivanič and Camps (2001), supporting the social nature of writing, assert that no writing is impersonal. They believe that any act of writing, regardless of the topic of the text, conveys a message about self. In the act of writing, a writer relies on and draws from his own experiences and prior knowledge. They argue that lexical, syntactical, semantic, even the visual and material aspects of writing construct identity, just as much as doing the phonetic and prosodic aspects of speech do; thus writing always conveys a representation of the self as writer. They assert that writer voice is a necessary feature of any piece of writing, not an 'optional extra' (p. 4). In every text, writers use different linguistic choices to present their different selves. Identity is not a fixed entity, and depending on the content and the discourse, writers may use different linguistic resources to create different identities. Many researchers believe that writer identities are influenced by the dominant ideologies of a discourse community and by the writers' interpretations of their personal, social, and cultural experiences (e.g., Clark & Ivanič, 1997, as cited in Rodriguez, Vazquez & Guzman, 2011; Hyland, 2002). Clark and Ivanič (1997, as cited in Rodriguez et al, 2011) identified 3 aspects of identity that writers bring to their writing: autobiographical self (affected by writers' personal life, opinions, beliefs, ideas), discoursal self (seeing self as a member of a discourse community), and authorial self (showing the authorship in presenting the ideas in their writing). They believe that writers create their identities from the discourses that are culturally available in their surroundings (socio-cultural aspect), which also help them interpret the world, represent themselves, and develop their identity as a member of their community (also Hyland, 2002; Ivanič, 1998, as cited in Lopez, 2012).

Similar to Clark and Ivanič, Hyland (2002) emphasises that academic writing, like all forms of communication is an act of identity: it not only coveys disciplinary 'content' but also carries a representation of the writer. He believes that writer identity is formed based on

culturally available discourses that the people of a particular community use to communicate. These discourses help the writers to interpret the world and present themselves in a manner that is connected to the structure and practices of their social and academic communities. To Hyland, when writers adopt practices and discourses of a certain social community, they gradually adopt its views and interpretations and perceive an academic work in the same way as others belonging to their own community would. In some instances, the discoursal choices allow writers to position themselves according to certain values and views that support certain identities.

Related to writer identity are the concepts that William Vande (1985, as cited in Rodriguez et al, 2011) used to explain the nature of writing. According to Vande, texts have propositional content level and writer-reader level. The propositional content level includes events and actions that are outside the text (seen in autobiographical self), but the writer-reader level is related to the statements that the writers make about the organisation of text or their reactions to the prepositions in the text (seen in authorial self). In both these levels (propositional and interactional), writers can show their presence differently, but it is more in the interactional level that the writer makes an authorial presence, that is, whether the author's voice can be heard and how strongly it is (Ivanič, 1998, as cited in Lopez 2012). They normally show their presence and their authorial self through the use of certain linguistic devices.

This ties in with the categorisation of writer identities proposed by John (2007). She believes that writers' identity may be seen in a text through the practices that the writer engages in while writing. John proposes that the writer identities can be defined into two categories: the academic identity and the person identity. The academic identity is revealed in the text by the writers aligning themselves with the academic discourse community. This identity is further sub-divided into the academic scholar and the academic organiser. The person identity is autobiographical identity about the writer (John, 2007).

A relevant issue when considering writer identities and rhetorical choices is highlighting the role of the audience. Hyland (2001) rightly points out that writing is a social interactive act and that we need to examine the texts carefully to find their discourse features and how these features engage their audiences.

In the next sections, the concepts that Hyland (2001, 2005) and Ivanič and Camps (2001) used to define the act and the characteristics of writing, the terms used to refer to authorial-self,

notion of reader engagement, and the rhetorical choices available to the writers to show their presence and to involve the readers are discussed.

2.6.2 Author's Self-representation and Identity and Use of Linguistic Devices

Acknowledging interactive, dialogic nature of writing, Hyland (2001, 2005) proposes a model of interaction which has two components: stance and engagement. Hyland explains that writers use these two components to meet the reader's expectations, to engage, and to rhetorically position their readers. They try to present their arguments credible by claiming solidarity with readers, evaluation of arguments, and acknowledging others' view, all to build solidarity, convince the readers, and gain their approval. They use different linguistic devices to do this.

Hyland uses the term 'stance' to refer to the writer's voice. To him, stance is a textual voice that has an attitudinal aspect which includes elements of writers' self-intrusion, evaluations, and opinions, all of which show their personal authority. Stance is related to writer features; therefore, it is writer-oriented and refers to the authorial voice and is realised by four linguistic devices: hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mentions (i.e. 'I' and 'we') (in relation to the use of inverted commas for pronouns henceforward, refer to Table 3.7, item 1.b). Engagement, on the other hand, is the aspect which includes writers' acknowledging the presence of their audience, trying to connect to them and drawing them into their arguments. Writers use personal pronouns, personal asides, imperatives, sharing knowledge and questions to engage the readers (Hyland, 2001).

In a later study, Hyland (2005) analysed professional academic papers to find how writers presented their socially defined persona. His finding showed that there are namely three elements: evidentiality, affect, and relation or presence that reveal writers' persona, and there are different linguistic devices to realise them. Evidentiality means how writers represent their commitment to the truth of what they are reporting and includes an evaluation from possibility/probability to certainty. The writers' expression of evidentiality signals the writers' stance toward what is set forth. The linguistic cues used for this are hedges (possible, probable,…), adverbs (possibly, probably,…), modals (might, may, could), verbs of thinking and believing, and emphatics (obvious, definitely,…). On the other hand, the affect aspect refers to writer's attitudes, whether personal or professional, toward the propositions and includes writer's perspectives, feelings and beliefs toward a proposition. It is realised by using certain verbs (e.g.,

agree, like), modals of necessity (have to, must, should), some adverbs (hopefully, fortunately) and some adjectives which relate to subjective evaluation (appropriate, important, logical…). The third aspect, relation or presence, refers to the extent that the writers make their presence visible in a text. It relates to interaction that the writer tries to have with the readers which can be maximised by using specific linguistic markers to directly address the readers such as use of pronouns and possessives or to indirectly involve them by using other rhetorical strategies. Presence or absence of these relational elements directly affects the degree of the writer's and reader's engagement with or indeed, detachment from the text. Thus, it can be said that a text that has more personal pronouns has a more interactive dialogic texture than those having more passive structures. Table 2.16 shows Hyland's framework.

Table 2.16

Hyland's (2005) Framework of Writer Voice

Elements of writer persona	In relation to	Linguistic devices
Evidentiality	-The extent of writer's certainty about a claim	-Evaluative words - Modals of possibilities and probabilities - Verbs (think, believe) - Hedges - Boosters
Affect	- Writer's attitudes (personal, professional), feelings and beliefs towards a proposition	- Verbs (agree, disagree,…) - Modals of necessity - Adverbs of opinion (fortunately..) - Adjectives of opinion (important,..)
Relation (presence)	- The extent writer is present in the text and interacts with readers	- Personal pronouns - Possessives - Imperatives - Questions

Ivanič and Camps (2001) used Halliday's typology (1994) and proposed a framework (see Table 2.17) which summarises the three aspects of writer identity (autobiographical, discoursal, authorial) with accompanying linguistic devices realising them. According to them, the ideational positioning relates to presenting something, knowledge transferring; the interpersonal positioning is about the writer's voice and engagement with the reader, and the textual positioning is about the text structure or meta-discourse. As the framework shows, the discoursal self of a writer identity is manifested in the use of different rhetorical choices. For instance, texts show different power relations between the reader and writer (interpersonal positioning). The more authoritative the writer sounds, the more power it exerts on the reader.

When writers use declarative mode to inform and assert, which is common in academic writing, there is a mild imposition of authority over the readers. However, when they use imperatives and interrogatives, the power relation is different. In imperatives, the writer shows more power over the reader, while by interrogatives the writer is sharing his power with the reader, seeing the reader as an equal. A sign of this shared power is use of pronoun 'we'. It shows equal authority (reader and writer) (p.26). Table 2.17 presents Ivanič and Camps' framework.

Table 2.17

Framework Proposed by Ivanič and Camps (2001, p. 11)

Types of positioning	In relation to	Linguistic realizations
Ideational positioning	-Different interests, objects of study, methodology	-lexical choices in noun phrases
	-Different stances towards topics: values, beliefs, and preferences	-Classificatory lexis -Generic references -Evaluative lexis -Syntactic choice
	-Different views of knowledge-making	-Verb tense -Verb type -Reference to human agency/ generic /specific reference -First person reference
Interpersonal positioning	-Different degrees of self-assurance and certainty	-Evaluation -Modality -First person references
	-Different power relationships between the writer and reader	-Mood -First person reference
Textual positioning	-Different views of how a writing text should be constructed	-Noun phrase length -Mono-vs. multisyllabic words -Linking devices -Semiotic mode

From the above, it might be assumed that the three types of positioning in Ivanič and Camps' framework also corresponds to Clark and Ivanič's (Clark & Ivanič, 1997, as cited in Rodriguez et al, 2011) concepts of writers' three selves: 'ideational' positioning corresponding to 'autobiographical self', 'interpersonal' positioning to 'discoursal self', and 'textual' positioning to 'authorial self'. In addition, these notions have overlaps with Hyland's concepts (2001, 2005) of 'evidentiality', 'affect' and 'relation'. We might say that the concepts of 'evidentiality' and 'affect' correspond to 'ideational' and 'interpersonal' positioning, and the concept of 'relation' to 'interpersonal' and 'textual' positioning. However, it seems that Hyland considers writer

presence and authorial voice mainly in the 'relation' element of a text, not in the 'evidentiality' or 'affect'.

In addition to the rhetorical devices that Hyland (2001, 2005) and Ivanič and Camps (2001) mentioned to indicate the authorial voice, other researchers showed other linguistic markers such as evaluative adverbs (Hunston & Thomspon, 2000), reporting verbs (John, 2012), modifying adverbs and 'As structures' (John, 2012) to uncover the extent of writer visibility. John (2007) calls the linguistic devices that writers choose to use to show their presence as 'visibility choices' and the use of first person pronouns as 'personality option'. She further suggests that to have a thorough understanding of student texts, both these aspects should be considered.

For this study, both typologies of writer identity by Ivanič and Camps (2001) and Hyland (2001, 2005) have been informative and concurrently useful to draw from.

2.6.3 Personal Pronouns and Objectives of This Study

What has been mentioned so far in this section about the writer visibility and rhetorical choices has been based on studies on academic papers and student essays (e.g., Chang, 2014; Hyland, 2001, 2005; Rodriguez et al, 2011; John, 2012). The conduct of any such a study on reader responses is almost non-existent, and if at all, rare. To answer question three of this study it would be informative to analyse student reader responses further to find out how students use personal pronouns for self-representation and for reader engagement. This will be one of a kind study that is reader-oriented (Hyland, 2005) in a true sense and explores features of such texts. The focus here therefore, will be on the use of personal pronouns ('I', 'We', 'You') and to a lesser extent, on verbs collocating with them. However, to be able to do that it is necessary to review the literature on the use and functions of personal pronouns. The following attempts to achieve that.

2.6.4 Personal Pronouns

Halliday and Hasan (1976) consider pronouns as one of the cohesive devices that provide reference points for the audience to understand a speech event or a text. Pronouns therefore, can refer to people, objects, or part of a text preceding them. Pronouns 'I' and 'we' refer to the writer/speaker, while pronoun 'you' refers to the audience. However, as Fortanet (2004) mentions the referent of these pronouns can sometimes be unclear. Fortanet asserts that "among the personal pronouns, the ones that are especially important for communication are the first and

second person pronouns due to the implications they have for both participants in the speech event" (2004, p. 46).

Personal pronouns are inter-subjective devices and as they have multiple semantic referents, they facilitate a writer's expression of opinions, knowledge claims and organising of the text (Harwood, 2005). Depending on the function, writers use personal pronouns "to reflect the writers' egocentricity or solidarity, involvement or distance, and sympathy or indifference in discourse" (Harwood, 2005, p. 96). As such, use of personal pronouns is not merely a grammatical choice but it has "sociolinguistic and pragmatic/rhetorical consideration" (Chang, 2014, p.97), one of which is what Clark and Ivanič (1997, as cited in Rodriguez et al, 2011) called writer identity and different writer's 'selves', and Hyland called writers' stance (element of 'affect') and engagement (element of 'relation').

Studies on the uses and functions of first and second person pronouns are wide-ranging and prolific. Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) found that the pronouns 'I', 'we', 'you' can be used in three ways: personal, impersonal, and vague. They provide examples to demonstrate the differences between these usages. Okamura (2009), analysing the academic speeches of lecturers, found five usages of the pronoun 'I', six usages of the pronoun 'you', and seven usages of the pronoun 'we'. Yeo and Ting (2014) analysed introductions of academic lectures and found two kinds of usages for pronoun 'I', two for 'you', and five for 'we'. Some researchers studied the functions of personal pronouns, especially those of first person singular and plural in academic texts (e.g., Herriman, 2007; Hyland, 2002; Kuo, 1999; Tang & John, 1999; Thonney, 2013) to demonstrate how writers' identities and authority are displayed.

In this study, the focus is on the semantic reference and discourse functions of personal pronouns in reader responses as a means for self-representation and reader engagement. By semantic reference, it is meant the referent that a pronoun refers to and by discourse function it means "the function that a sentence containing a personal pronoun performs in the immediate discourse context of a journal article. It reflects the specific communicative purpose of writer-researchers in a certain part of a journal article" (Kuo, 1999, p. 130). Of course in this study, the discourse function of personal pronouns (I, we, you) is considered in the reader responses context.

It is argued that writers use personal pronouns to express their stance, to communicate with readers, and to be part of the academic community (e.g., Hyland, 2001, 2005; Vladimirou,

2007). In reader responses, personal pronouns function in some of the ways noted briefly above. In the rest of this section, the theoretical approaches taken in regards to academic writing, the notion of writer identity, the rhetorical devices for realisation of writer/reader relationship especially by the use of personal pronouns, and examination of uses and functions of personal pronouns in student reader responses will be presented.

In the following, there is a section for each of these pronouns (I, we, you) with a short literature review of their typology and discourse functions. This will help in finding the types of usages and discourse functions of these pronouns in student responses here.

2.6.4.1 Uses and functions of the first person singular pronoun.

One way the writers show their presence in writing is the use of first person pronouns. If fact, many researchers believe the use of first person singular subject is the most important way of expressing an identity by writers (Herriman, 2007; Hyland, 2001; Rodriguez et al, 2011; Tang & John, 1999). According to Hrisonopulo (2007), pronoun 'I' which refers to the speaker also has the first-person mode of thinking which is tied to psychological structure of 'self'. 'I' as the knower of 'self' involves a range of subjective experiences which include sense of agency and ownership for actions as well as having access to one's own self. This sense of agency and ownership contributes to the role that 'I' plays in performative utterances (p. 245). Also the access to one's self and experiences conveys a sense of certainty about 'I' to the listener/reader. It shows speaker's egocentric space (Runggaldier, 1995, as cited in Hrisonopulo, 2007), and helps to present 'I' as having a high degree of 'experientially anchored certainty' (Hrisonopulo, 2007, p. 246) resulting in the writer being viewed as an agentive power. Similarly, Herriman (2007) argues that when writers present themselves as the subjects of finite verbs, they take responsibility of the action the verb presents (e.g., I demonstrate … vs. this essay demonstrates…) (p. 4). She further argues that the first person subject in thematic position in the clause, "is the most powerful means by which writers express an identity by asserting their claim to speak as an authority,…."(Herriman, 2007, p. 4).

The use of first person varies according to the discipline (e.g., Hyland, 2002), within discipline (e.g., Harwood, 2005) and within genres (e.g., Martines, 2005), but generally expert writers use first person in their writing to take credit for their ideas, to describe their methodology in gathering data, and to conclude their findings or for their expertise (Herriman, 2007; Thonney, 2013).

Due to having multiple semantic roles, personal pronouns are used in texts to fulfil multiple functions: use of self-mention 'I', the strongest form of authorial self, presents writers' ego and their commitment to what they are setting forth and their responsibility for it (Chang, 2014). Hyland (2001) asserts that in research articles authors use self-mention to show their close association with their work or to pursue their audience (from their own discipline) to accept their arguments.

In Hyland's study (2002), it was found that the undergraduate students of different majors used first person pronouns to 'state a goal or procedure', 'explain a procedure', 'state results and claims', 'express self-benefits', and 'explain an argument'. In a similar study, Thonney (2013) found that the rhetorical functions of first person pronouns in course papers of undergraduate students included 'making a claim', 'describing a procedure', 'expressing uncertainty', 'relating personally', 'showing understating', 'introducing topics', and 'addressing readers'. Tang and John (1999) analysed college student essays and outlined six different genre roles that writers might adopt by using first person pronouns: 'the representative of a specific group of people', 'the guide through the essay', 'the architect or builder of the essay', 'the reporter of the research process', 'the opinion holder', and 'the originator'. Clark and Ivanič (1997, as cited in Rodriquez et al, 2011) found that 'I' was used for 'structuring the essay', 'presenting personal experiences', and 'making a statement of value and belief'. Similarly, Natsukari (2012) found that pronoun 'I' was used by the writers for 'referring to personal matters', for 'opinions', for 'organizing the text', and for 'conversation' (see Table B1 in Appendix B for a summary).

As mentioned earlier, researchers have used different categorisations for the typology of personal pronouns including pronoun 'I'. However, all the studies mentioned above have been done on speech (e.g., Okamura, 2011) or texts other than student reader responses (e.g., Tang & John, 1999 on student essays; Thonney, 2013 on student course papers). Therefore, exploring the use of personal pronouns in this study will enrich the literature in this area.

2.6.4.2 Uses and functions of the first person plural pronoun.

The usages of pronoun 'we' has been studied by many researchers (e.g., Chang, 2014; Fortanet, 2004; Harwood, 2005; Hyland, 2001, 2002; Kuo, 1999; Okamura, 2011, Yeo & Ting, 2014). It was found that 'we' can have different semantic references when used in academic lectures. Examining the introduction parts of lectures, Yeo and Ting (2014) found that 'we' was used to refer to 4 types of referents. Rounds (1987, as cited in Yeo & Ting, 2014) divided the

'we' usages into inclusive-we (you and I) and exclusive-we (I and they), we for I, we for you, and we for one. In a more detailed study on the lecturers' speech, 'we' was found to refer to seven different referents (Okamura, 2011). Using the corpus of academic lectures, Fortanet (2004) found nine referents for 'we' in the speech of university lecturers, which made him state that the referent of 'we' could be as large as all people or as narrow as only the speaker.

In addition to the studies done on the uses of 'we' in the spoken mode of language (e.g., speeches, lectures), the said usage was also examined in the written mode. However, it seems in this mode, researchers found the referents of 'we' to be inclusive-we and exclusive-we only. Harwood (2005), for example, states, "while *inclusive- we* refers to the writer and reader together, *exclusive-we* refers solely to the writer and other persons associated with the writer" [emphasis in original] (p. 343). Others had the same findings in their studies that examined academic papers (e.g., Chang, 2014; Hyland, 2001; Kuo, 1999). Kuo (1999) believes that by using inclusive-we, writers try to involve readers into their arguments and they also assume that the reader has knowledge of the topic. Similarly, examining students' argumentative essays, Chang (2014) asserts:

'' 'Exclusive we' has a semantic dimension of we vs. you or we vs. they. While 'inclusive we' includes a broader audience and stresses a sense of communality, it can signal the readers' involvement in the discourse and secure their agreement" (p. 110).

The functions of 'we' have also been examined and found to show the 'novelty and newsworthiness' of the writer's work, as a meta discourse device to 'organise the paper' (Harwood, 2005), as 'representation of all or specific groups of people' (Fortanet, 2004; Tang & John, 1999), as a means to achieve group solidarity and 'sense of communality' (Chang, 2014), and to 'readers in an argument' towards writer's preferred interpretation or in other words 'positioning' them (Hyland, 2001, 2002). Some researchers related the use of inclusive-we with positive politeness (Harwood, 2005), while use of 'you' and 'I' have been claimed to have the effect of distancing and creating a negative politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987, as cited in Fortanet, 2004). However, Harwood (2005) believes that communal pronouns can construct negative politeness as well as positive when the writers want *to* 'criticise' the practices of their discourse community or a specific group of people they are part of (e.g., "*we don't know why…*"; "*we don't have a full understanding of …*") (in relation to the use of quotations and italics here and in subsequent similar cases, see Table 3.7, items 2 and 3.a).

Another reason for the use of inclusive pronouns is that they have a low-risk function. Tang and John (1999), for example, found that 'I' as representative is "usually used as 'we' or 'us' as a proxy for a larger group of people" (p. S27). Similarly, Hyland (2001, 2005) believes writers use 'reader engagement' strategies through a range of devices to engage readers and manage their possible disagreement. These devices are politeness, references to shared knowledge, situating and 'positioning' of readers so that they could be won over by the writer's arguments. He further explains that to elicit a reader's agreement, writers also use rhetorical strategies to create a dialogue with their readers through the use of questions, directives, and shared knowledge. Use of directives is mostly present in the form of imperatives, modals of obligation, and by a predicate adjective emphasising the importance followed by a to-clause. Shared knowledge, on the other hand, is a less forceful strategy to 'position' the reader. This makes the argument seem as a form of insiders' discourse resulting in mutual understanding (Hyland, 2001). Overall, the functions of 'we' can be said to have the aim of increasing the audience engagement (Hyland, 2002), creating a bond or solidarity between the speaker/writer and the audience (Chang, 2014; Harwood, 2005), and decreasing potential disfavour (Hyland, 2001; Okamura, 2011) (For a summary of the rhetorical functions of 'we' see Table B2 in Appendix B).

After reviewing the uses and functions of first person pronouns, we now turn to the last subject pronoun studied here, that of 'you'.

2.6.4.3 Uses and functions of second person pronoun.

Studies on different genres have yielded different results on the usages of the pronoun 'you' (e.g., Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990; Yeo & Ting, 2014). Yeo and Ting (2014) identified two uses of 'you' in lecture introductions: you-audience and you-general. Kuo (1999) did an empirical study on the uses of personal pronouns (I, we, you, he/she/they, and indefinite pronouns) in journal articles belonging to three science disciplines and found that the only usage of 'you' in the articles was that of you-general (not the you-audience).

The functions that pronoun 'you' have can be diverse too. We have seen that writers use self-mention pronouns 'I' and 'we' to show their authority, confidence, and judgment. However, they use reader engagement devices such as second person pronoun to acknowledge the readers' presence and obtain their agreement on the issues proposed. Hyland (2005, p.2) lists the linguistic devices, besides the inclusive-we, that writers use to bring the reader into their texts as

second person pronouns, interjections, questions, instructions and reference to shared knowledge. However, he believes that the pronoun 'you' has properties that might set it aside from other pronouns because unlike first person pronouns that are writer-oriented, pronoun 'you' is reader-oriented. 'You' is consequently more interpersonal than 'I' and 'we' since the presence of a reader is assumed (Kuo, 1999; Petch-Tyson, 1998). Similarly, Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) explain that the personal pronouns are referential especially in the first and second persons. While first person pronouns refer to the speaker/writer the second person pronouns refer to an addressee or a group but not including the speaker/writer.

Some argue that pronoun 'you' is not completely detached from the reader or speaker. However, use of this pronoun can become complicated not only because its referent can be only one or more than one person, but also because of the semantic considerations. Biber, Johnson, Leech, Conrad, and Finnegan (1999, as cited in Fortanet, 2004, p.46) mention that "the meaning of the first person plural is often vague and 'you' is similar to 'we' in being used with different intended referents" (p. 329). They therefore conclude, that due to their vagueness, it is usually the audience who has to infer who the referent is (p. 330), and whether 'we' or 'you' used, is intended for them only or for a larger group of people that includes them. Scheibman (2007, as cited in De Hoop & Hogeweg, 2014) asserts that the use of 'generic you' has a solidarity effect, to get the involvement and agreement of the reader by raising the sense of self-ascription (finding oneself as the addressee in a speech or writing) in the audience and sense of 'feeling of empathy or at least identification' with the writer (De Hoop & Hogeweg, 2014, p. 113).

Generally, the use of 'you' is seen more so in conversation and oral presentation than in writing, but many writers, especially those in soft disciplines might use it in their texts. Hyland (2001), for example, found that academic writers use inclusive-we more than 'I', 'you', and 'your' (rarely used). He hypothesised that the avoidance of using 'you' might be due to writers' attempt to avoid detachment that 'you' conveys so as to avoid the gap that might appear to exist between the writer and the reader. Also by using you- general the writers try to convey that 'anyone in the field' as a way of persuasion, and emphasising their membership in the group (solidarity). Kuo (1999) has the same findings and believes that 'you' might sound offensive or detached as it separates readers from the writer. Therefore, it was not surprising that all eight instances of 'you' usages found in his study were for 'you general' referring to all researchers in the discipline. To Chang (2014), use of 'you' can not only distance the writer from the reader but

also may suggest the feeling that the writer knows better than the reader. Others point to the tone that the use of 'you' has. More than a hundred years ago, Jespersen (1909, as cited in Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990) asserted that in 'we' there is a notion of humility by speaker including him/herself, but in 'you' there is a tone of colloquialism. Similarly, others (e.g., Biber, 1987, as cited in Natsukari, 2012) explain that the use of 'I' and 'you' indicate a more colloquial, informal, and interactive aspect of language. This might be the reason why their usage in academic writing is questionable by some (e.g., Breeze, 2007). Another reason for not using these pronouns especially 'you' in academic writing could possibly be due to its seemingly strong authoritative tone (Chang, 2014).

Yeo and Ting (2014) found that the you-audience had the functions of 'an audience's prior knowledge', 'giving instructions or making announcements', 'sharing personal experiences', and 'directing students' attention', while the function of you-general was for 'explaining the subject matter' (see Table B3 in Appendix B for the summary of rhetorical functions of 'you').

After reviewing the literature on the topics of interest to this study, it will be informative to see how students in this study used personal pronouns in their reader responses and what rhetorical functions they performed. I will now turn to the next chapter, the methodology used for the conduct of this study.

CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

The three main research questions of this study address different aspects of reader responses and consequently, each question needs to be answered using a different approach. As there have been different methodological approaches addressing these research questions, I will present the methodology used for responding to each of these questions under a separate heading. This will allow a clear description and explanation of the issues at hand and the methods used to deal with each question. It will also make room for presenting samples of original reading texts or/and student responses (scripts). However, firstly, I will describe the study, the context of the study, and the approach.

3.1 Defining the Study

This research focussed on written samples of EFL students' reader responses in a Saudi university. The purpose of this study was to investigate the following: a) the choice of reading topics amongst these students and particularly the effect of the discipline on their topic choice and on their responses, b) the characteristics of student texts (reader responses) with a particular focus on levels of cognitive engagement, their generic structure, and the relationship between these two, c) use of personal pronouns for self-representation and reader engagement, and their rhetorical functions.

Context of the Study

The study was done during three academic semesters (Sep 2012-Jan 2013; Feb 2013-May 2013; Sep 2013- Jan 2014). Some of my colleagues who taught the advanced reading courses helped me in giving this assignment (for details refer to the following section under Defining the task/assignment) to the students, collecting the responses and submitting them to me.

Subjects

Subjects were two groups of female EFL students from different disciplines: pre-nursing and pre-med. They were admitted to the university as high school graduates and their ages ranged from 19-21. Students were attending a Saudi university in Riyadh. The nursing students usually have a lower English proficiency level (beginner/low intermediate) while the pre-med

students usually have a higher proficiency level (intermediate/high intermediate) as determined by an English proficiency test (prepared by the English Department) administered at the time of admission to the university for placement purposes. Students with a higher high school Grade Point Average (GPA) are admitted to the pre-med program and those with a lower GPA to the nursing program. As the student records are of a confidential nature, it will not be possible for me to obtain the official list of these students with their GPAs and English test results even for research purposes. However, given that it is the practice that students with a certain higher GPA are admitted in the pre-med group and the rest to the pre-nursing this is indicative that the pre-med group has more academic and language proficiency than the pre-nursing group.

Course

Since the theoretical premise of this study is the idea of interdependency of reading and writing and boosting that connection as a pedagogically appropriate practice (Brown, 2001; Flowerdew & Peacock, 2001; Hirvela, 2001; Krashen & Lee, 2004; Nunan, 1999; Shen, 2008), it was a good opportunity to conduct this research on students who were attending a reading course (ENGL 212: Advanced Reading and Vocabulary), which does not require the students to undertake any writing tasks. This course is offered to the students in semester three, after one year of having extensive English courses in semesters 1 and 2 where they also learn how to write paragraphs and essays for academic purposes in different rhetorical modes. The English courses and textbooks are unified and offered to all students regardless of their discipline. The English program has the traditional approach in teaching language i.e. segregation of skills. This advanced reading course (ENGL 212) therefore, does not have any writing component. However, based on the literature (refer to the Literature Review Chapter) which shows that reading and writing are two sides of the same coin, the reader response assignment was added to this course as a learning task.

Defining the Task/Assignment

Students were asked to select any reading texts of their own choice from any sources they wanted. This meant that they would be reading authentic texts, texts that are not necessarily created for the pedagogical purposes. They were instructed to read five different reading texts, write a paragraph summarising each text, and have a separate entry as their reflection about each reading passage they had read (see the instruction sheet in Appendix C). In their reflection, they were to express their opinions about the text, focus on specific information if they wanted, show

their understanding of the text, and relate it to themselves and to broader issues. They were informed that there was no limit to the length of their writing. They were also asked to submit all five original reading passages along with the five journal entries, during the 15-week semester, one every three weeks.

Sampling Procedure

The participants in this study were from 4 pre-nursing and 4 pre-med classes. A total of 188 sets of reader responses were collected and thoroughly examined for inclusion in the study. To be included, students were required to submit all 5 responses, and the responses were not to be copied from the original reading text although paraphrasing of the authors' ideas was accepted. The examination showed that 182 students submitted all 5 responses (a total of 910 responses/scripts), one student submitted 4 responses, three submitted only 3 responses, and two submitted a literal copy of the reading passages as their responses. Therefore, those incomplete reader response sets and those copied from the reading texts were excluded from the total student sample. Consequently, only 182 sets of responses (86 sets from the pre-med and 96 sets from the pre-nursing groups) met the criteria to be included in the study. To have an even number of participants and responses in both groups, which would make the statistical procedures and interpretation of the results easier but at the same time have an effect of randomness, I decided to include 60 student scripts of each student group through the use of random sampling tool from the options of SPSS statistical package. First, I gave a number to each student in each student group (from 1-86 for the pre-med and 1-96 to the pre-nursing groups). Then I entered the numbers in the SPSS data cells and chose the random sampling option. It gave me 60 random numbers (student numbers, e.g., 3, 8, 19 ...). I then renumbered those 60 chosen students' numbers from 1-60. Using this technique, from the total complete sets of student samples (86 pre-med students, 96 pre-nursing students) a random sample of 60 pre-med and 60 pre-nursing students (120 students X 5 responses = 600 responses) was selected and included in the study. The responses varied ranging from one sentence consisting of only 4 words by a pre-nursing student to a text of 593 words composed by a pre-med student. These varied text lengths were a good representation of students' actual writing ability and showed their level of interaction with the reading texts.

3.2 Methodological Considerations

Since there was not any specific feedback given to the students on their writing (in order to make it more natural without any intervention), there was no grade assigned to this task; however, they would get a full mark for completing the assignments. Marks were not awarded for what or how they had written their responses. This mark would be added to their other marks (attendance and participation, which is worth a total of 5% of marks achievable). This was to take into consideration the concerns of those researchers (e.g., Plack et al, 2005) who argue that grading journals might affect the student responses negatively, and others who question the objectivity of evaluating something that is subjective by nature (Shen, 2008).

As mentioned above, to be able to determine as to whether the submitted work of the students had been written on their own, and not merely by copying the reading passage, the students were required to submit a copy of the passage along with their responses. I then proceeded with the following steps: reading the original text, followed by the student's summary of the text, and finally, reading their reflection. The responses then would be considered for placing in one of the four categories of levels of cognition in the model that I developed (see Table 2.13 in Chapter 2).

Coding Student Responses

Students' responses were either typed or handwritten when they were handed in. I typed out all of the student responses on the computer to create a softcopy to work on them further. To keep the originality of the students' texts, no editing was done. To identify students' scripts, a coding system was devised. The code shows the student's group (pre-med [PM], pre-nursing [PN]); a number [1-60] referring to each student in each group; and a letter [A-E] showing the text number of each student [A being the first text and E the fifth). Therefore, a code such as PM.1.C means the text is the third reader response of the first student in the pre-med group. It should be remembered that from here onward, whenever student scripts are presented, this coding system is utilised and inserted at the end of each script. Also, all the student scripts are placed in quotation marks and italicised. Additionally, the word author refers to the author or writer of the original reading text and the word writer refers to the student writer.

3.3 Methodological Approach in Addressing Research Question 1

The first question of this study consists of three sub-questions: what reading topics are of interest to the pre-nursing and pre-med students, what is the impact of students' major on their choice of reading topics, and how their choice affects the length of their responses. To start with, I had to do a pilot study to analyse student responses by adopting a systematic approach in categorising the reading topics. The following explains this approach, and examples of student scripts are presented.

3.3.1 Categorisation of the Reading Topics

To categorise the topics of the reading texts, I reviewed the classification schemes used in Dewey Decimal Classes (DDC) and Universal Decimal Classification (UDC). In DDC, there are ten categories of subjects: general works (computer science and Information), philosophy and psychology, religion, social sciences, pure science, technology, arts and recreation, literature, history and geography. In UDC, which is mainly based on DDC, the categories are more or less the same as those in DDC. Having an idea of what the main categorisation of topics are, and having looked at the titles of the students' chosen reading topics, it seemed that having the following ten categories would be reasonable: *Education*, *Health*, *Fashion*, *Literature*, *Nutrition*, *Psychology*, *Society*, *Spiritual*, *News*, and *Environment* (in relation to the use of italics for notions hereafter, refer to Table 3.7, item 3.b). However, after categorisation of the topics, it turned out that relying on the titles or topics of the reading texts was not sufficient for their categorisation as some of these categories were in fact, sub-categories. Also, having too many categories, some of which consisting of only one or two samples (e.g., *News*) could possibly lead to a disparity in the results. Therefore, for this study I revised the categories. Instead of relying on the titles of the reading passages, I adopted a particular form of categorisation that was based on the content of the reading texts. I sought the help of one of my colleagues, who has a Master's degree in Education and has been an English lecturer for seven years, teaching primarily writing courses, to assist me in deciding on the theme of the reading texts. We created the table below with the description as we came across any subtopic related to the main themes. This helped us formulate the categorisation process more efficiently. We were able to categorise the topics of the reading texts under six broader categories: *Education*, *Health*, *Literature*, *Psychology*, *Society*, and *Environment*. The table below (Table 3.1) shows each topic category with its description and some sample subtopics.

Table 3.1

Reading Topics Categories and Their Descriptions and Subtopics

Reading topic categories	Description	Examples of reading topics
1. Education	Topics that relate to school/college life, curriculum, or studying in general	- Cramming (PN.3.B) - Anatomy in medical curriculum (PM.20.C) - College life: time management (PM.50.B)
2. Health	Topics related to physical health, medicine and health-care	- X-rays (PN.37.E) - Tanning (PM.5.C) - Organic food (PM.34.E)
3. Literature	All reading topics of short or long stories, personal narratives, biographies, and movie reviews	- Short story: The wolf in sheep's clothing (PN.19.A) - Long story: Friends (PN.50.B) - Biography: Martin Luther King (PM.25.A)
4. Psychology	Topics dealing with human behaviour (their feelings and their mental health)	- Friendship (PN.18.A) - Power of words (PN. 46.A) - Computer addiction (PM.19.A)
5. Society	Topics about any social issues that relate to society in large	- Child abuse (PN.14.B) - Smoking ban (PN.19.C) - Medical tourism (PM.25.B)
6. Environment	Those topics that mainly deal with environment (e.g., water, deserts, pollution, animals, farming, sea	- Deserts (PN.51.E) - How to clean environment? (PN.57.E) - Global warming (PM.23.A)

Based on this categorisation, some topic categories that I had assigned a separate category in the pilot study were now put under some other categories. For example, topics under the category of *Nutrition* (5 cases) were placed under *Health* since their main purpose was to promote physical health and healthy eating habits. Also, the topics of *Fashion* (only 2 cases) were placed under *Society* because their content was related to how fashion affects society. In addition, the text under the category of *News* was placed under the category of *Society* for two reasons. Firstly, the reading content was talking about a social event, and secondly, having it under *News* would emphasise the genre not the content. The category of *Spiritual* was also placed under the category of *Psychology* as it dealt with human feelings and the mind (for samples of different categories of reading topics see Appendix D).

For assigning the texts to their proper categories, we read the text thoroughly and asked what the main idea of text was and what message it was trying to convey. Based on the answer, the text was categorised under one of the six categories. Use of some linguistic devices, namely nouns, was also helpful in categorisation of the reading texts (for more, refer to the explanation offered under each sample in Appendix D). Hence, we could say that the titles of the reading texts, though suggestive of the main idea of the text, were not precise enough for categorisation

purposes as the contexts within which the main ideas were discussed would determine the categorisation. The following table shows such a text that initially seemed to be difficult to assign to a category but focusing on its main ideas facilitated its categorisation (in relation to the use of bold print in original reading texts hereafter, see Table 3.7, item 4).

Table 3.2

Sample of an Original Reading Passage and the Categorisational Process

Chosen by (PN.19.C)
Smoking Ban **In 2006**, **parliament voted** to **ban smoking** in all **workplaces**, on **public** and **work transport**, in **pubs**, **clubs**, **membership clubs, cafes, restaurants and shopping centres in England and Wales**. The smoking ban **came into force** in **Scotland** on **March 26th 2006**. **In Wales**, it was **enforced from April 2nd**. **In Northern Ireland**, the ban **came into effect on April 30th**. **England followed suit** on **July 1st 2007**, with the **entire UK now** officially **smoke-free in public places.** Background Although smoking is known to cause lung cancer, the effect of passive smoking has proved harder to quantify. A 2002 report by the International Agency for Research on Cancer suggested that regular exposure to passive smoke increases the risk of lung cancer by 20 to 30 per cent. According to the British Medical Association, it increases the risk of heart disease by between 25 and 35 per cent and doubles the risk of a stroke. **The majority of workplaces, shops, public transport and other public environments had banned** or at least **restricted** smoking as **a matter of policy** by the **mid-1990s**, but it **remained legal** to smoke in most **licensed premises**. However, **in the years leading up to the ban**, there **was an increase in support** for **more restrictions** on smoking **in public places**. Although this partly **reflected the decline in the numbers of smokers**, it also **reflected** the greater assertiveness of **non-smokers**, many of whom were less prepared to tolerate smoking. **In November 2004**, the **government published** the **white paper on public health**, detailing **its intention** to **introduce a partial ban**, which would make it **illegal** to smoke in **enclosed public spaces in England and Wales**. However, an **exception** would be made for **licensed premises** such as bars, private clubs and pubs where no food was served. There would be **a complete ban** on smoking in the bar area of **licensed premises**, to protect staff. **Legislation** to this effect **was introduced in October 2005**, as part of the **health improvement and protection bill**. The ban was intended to **come into force in 2007**. **By this point**, the **Scottish Executive** had already **voted to introduce a complete ban** on smoking in **enclosed public spaces in Scotland**, which **came into force in 2006**. **In 2003**, **New York City** had also **banned smoking** in all public bars and restaurants, with only **a few exceptions**. **Many towns and cities in California** have also done this, and a few also banned smoking **on their beaches and in public parks**. **In March 2004**, **Ireland** became **the first European country to institute** an **outright ban** on smoking in the **workplace**. Many **advocates of a ban in England and Wales** favoured this wording, because it emphasised **the need to protect** those who do not have a choice over their exposure to second-hand smoke, namely those working in smoky environments such as pubs and bars. **Italy and Norway** then **followed** suit, **introducing a total ban on smoking in bars and restaurants**.
Source: http://www.politics.co.uk/reference/smoking-ban

In this text, the title, Smoking ban, could have been assumed to be about the health hazards of second hand smoking and banning it for patients, a pure health-related idea. However, by reading it thoroughly, it became clear that it was not focusing on the health aspect of it as much as on the history of smoking bans in different countries and the specifics about the smoking ban in each country. There were a number of linguistic cues that also helped me to come to this conclusion. The use of past tense verbs indicating the occurrence of actions in the past, and specific time indicators (by the mid-1990s, in Nov 2004, In 2003,…) showing when these events took place were some of them. Other linguistic cues were the use of certain lexical items such as names of specific countries indicating the place of each event (Ireland, New York, England, Wales, Italy,…), words indicating power relations in a society showing the political systems and how they operate (government, introducing a bill/a total ban, outright ban, coming into force, institute, non-smokers, workers, restriction, white paper on public health, Scottish Executive, vote, illegal, an exception, legislation, need to protect), and some general terms pertaining to certain places (workplaces, public places, pubs, restaurants, enclosed areas, licensed premises). The most important key word was 'ban' which has a meaning of laws/rules that forbid something and refers to social relations and regulations. All of these pointers made me categorise it under the category of *Society*.

After coding all the reading topics, the data was compiled and analysed using descriptive statistics, namely SPSS v.16. The student discipline was entered in the data to see its impact on the choice of topics.

As for the effect of reading topics on the quality of student writing responses, it was shown in the Literature Review Chapter that researchers have used various methods (e.g., text length, word frequency, lexical complexity, lexical features, syntactic structures, cohesive ties, topical structuring, and others) as indicators of quality of writing (e.g., Abdel Latif, 2008, 2009; Crossley & McCarthy, 2010; Cahyono, 2000; Ferris, 1994; Grant & Ginther, 2000; Intraraprawat & Steffensen, 1995; Lavin Crerand, 1993; Mellor, 2010; Schneider & Connor, 1990). What all of these studies have shown can be phrased as what Ferris (1994) has mentioned that longer essays or texts are more likely to show how students develop their ideas fully and produce relatively good compositions. Thus, text length (measured by the number of words) although not a sole indicator of quality of a text, (as one could possibly produce pages of unrelated, confusing or repetitive ideas), can be of value in a reader response genre to show how much one is motivated

to write about a specific topic and not about others. It is therefore not the correlation between the quality of text and text length that is of importance here, but more so the identification of topics that could produce a more developed (longer) response than others. The text length was of importance also because the participants in this study had different English language proficiency levels and it was useful to see what topics could evoke longer responses from students in one or both groups. Another reason that the text length was used, is due to the fact that question two of this study is on generic structuring of the reader responses which will undertake a closer examination of the textual features of the responses. Using text length (word count) therefore, would pave the way for a discussion about this question as the shorter texts (of one or a few sentences) usually cannot encompass all moves or parts of a genre or a generic structure. Both descriptive and inferential statistics have been used for a response to this question.

3.4 Methodology in Addressing the Research Question 2

The second question of this research is related to the characteristics of student responses in terms of both levels of cognitive engagement with the reading texts and their generic structure, and the relationship that may exist between these two. Firstly, I will discuss the methodology utilised in determining the level of cognition as evidenced in the student texts and thereafter turn to examining their generic structure.

As mentioned earlier, I developed a model of evaluating and quantifying cognitive levels for the student responses (please refer to Table 2.13 in the Literature Review Chapter). To be able to determine the level of student cognitive engagement with the reading texts, I read the original writer's (original author) text first and then read the student (writer) response. The lowest level of cognitive engagement is level 1 in which the writer just repeats or *narrates* what she has read; the writer makes no attempt to introduce an original idea in her writing. In level 2, there is evidence of simple reasoning or *interpretational* attempts at adopting and maintaining a considered position and claim, supported by some ideas from the writer's prior knowledge or experience. In level 3, the writer displays a strong affinity with the topic in question and with other relevant areas of knowledge surrounding the topic. She consequently displays this knowledge in her writing drawing from shared knowledge and/or personal or shared experiences. In level 4, the highest level of cognitive engagement, the writer connects the reading topic to other social, ethical, political issues and calls for a certain course of action. Now we examine

more closely the approach taken in the categorisation of the texts based on the model that quantifies levels of cognitive engagement.

3.4.1 Determining Levels of Cognitive Engagement: Coding Scheme and Coding Reliability

Literature on reflective journals shows that different researchers used different units for coding. Some used a holistic approach by reading the whole text and coding it (Al Mahrooqi, 2011a, 2011b; Dreyfus & Brailla, 2005), and some used an analytical approach by coding individual sentences or paragraphs (e.g., Plack et al, 2005; Plack et al, 2007; Wallman et al., 2008). While the researchers in the reader response studies used a holistic approach in their coding, some researchers in their reflective journal studies used an analytical approach. However, this caused some degree of difficulty for them in assigning the most appropriate and accurate form of coding to the units. For instance, Wong et al (1995) faced problems in analytical coding based on Boud et al's (1985) model of reflectivity which had 5 stages. Each stage was named, and the names were as follows: 'Attending to feelings', 'Association', 'Integration', 'Validation', 'Appropriation or Outcome of reflection'. The problem was the coders first had to agree on the paragraph that showed student's reflectivity and then decide which stage of reflection (from the 5) was most relevant and appropriate. To address the discrepancies in the raters' coding, they decided to take the higher codes for reflection and ignore the lower codes. For example, if a paragraph was coded as 'Association' by some raters and 'Integration' by others, it would be coded as 'Integration'. The argument was that two close stages of reflection (or two close code levels such as 'Association' and 'Integration') can have some elements of both stages, and hence, opting for a higher code (e.g., 'Integration') would cover the element of the lower code (e.g., 'Association') but choosing the lower code would not cover the notions of the higher code. This was also seen in Sparks-Langer et al's study (1990) by opting for a one level up approach to solve discrepancy in coding. They decided to consider one level of difference in coding done by two coders to be acceptable but would record the higher code as the final code. If the difference was more than one level, the whole text would be re-examined and re-evaluated for the purposes of recoding.

For this study, I decided to pilot both of these coding approaches, holistic and analytical, on 10 student responses to critically evaluate which of the 2 approaches was more practical. I asked one of our senior English lecturers, a native speaker of English with a Master's degree in Applied Linguistics, to help me with the coding. There was a discrepancy of one level between

our holistic coding in 3 cases, for which we discussed our coding and in two cases we agreed on a particular code, but could not reach an agreement on the remaining case. We therefore decided to record the higher code as the final code, similar to what the other researchers had done (e.g., Wong et al, 1995). However, there were more discrepancies in our analytical coding of the same texts. The following table (Table 3.3) shows both of these coding approaches and the results we found.

Table 3.3

Results of Analysing 10 Texts Using Both Holistic and Analytical Approaches

Text number	Coding (1=narrating, 2=interpretational, 3=relating to self and others, 4= prescriptive judgment)			
	Holistic approach		Analytical approach (sentence-based)	
	Coder 1	Coder 2	Coder 1	Coder 2
1	2	2	1,2,1,2,3,3,2,3,1	1,2,2,2,3,2,2,1
2	3	3	2,1,2,2,3,4	2,2,2,2,3,3
3	2	3	2,3,3,3,2,3,3,2	2,3,3,3,3,3,2,2
4	1	1	1,2,1	1,2,1
5	2	3	1,2,2,2	1,3,2,2
6	2	2	1,1,2,1	1,1,2,1
7	3	3	3,2,2,2,2	3,3,3,2,2
8	3	3	3,3	3,3
9	2	3	3,2,2	3,2.2
10	4	4	1, 3,4,4,4	1,2,3,4,4

There were also some other problems that made the use of an analytical approach difficult but supported the use of a holistic approach. The main problems were: interconnection of sentences, presence of different levels of cognition in texts, and students' insufficient language proficiency as evidenced in producing faulty sentences and the inappropriate use of lexical items. In the following paragraphs, each of these problems is discussed and justification for the use of a holistic approach is presented.

1. Interconnection of sentences or textuality: As discussed in the Literature Review Chapter, discourse analysts (e.g., Widdowson; 2007) and some other linguists (e.g., Halliday & Hasan, 1976) rightly emphasise that a text is not a combination of isolated sentences but a 'semantic unit'; it cannot therefore be analysed without considering the other contextual elements, among which are sentences preceding and following each sentence. This is especially evident in sentences that are meant to illustrate a point or provide evidence. The following sentences

(considered as isolated sentences) from a student's response, example 3.1 below, highlight this difficulty. I deliberately changed the order of the sentences to enhance the effect, as reading these isolated sentences in the order originally written could still have the propensity to create a cohesive meaning in our mind no matter how hard we attempt to view them as isolated sentences.

"For example, if there any misunderstand, she can solve this problem." (Use of "*For example"* here requires the reader to refer to the preceding sentence; also the referent of *she* is not clear. As an isolated sentence, it could possibly be classified under level 2 because it displays some attempt at interpretation) (in relation to the use of italics henceforth, refer to Table 3.7, item 3.a).

"She should be not shy." (The referent of "*she*" is not clear. This sentence can be considered as showing level 2 [interpretational] or level 3 cognition [relating to self or others]).

"In my opinion I agree with him about how is important the friend in the life and characteristic." (Level 2, as it shows writer's position and the basis for the position taken).

"This will help her to deal with people especially when she meet a new people." (The referent of "*This*" is not clear, nor is it for "*her"*. Again, this sentence could be considered for both level 2 and level 3 cognition).

"*Best friend should be smart to face any problem or situation."* (Level 2, making an assertion and proffering a reason for it).

"All this characteristic make me I chose this person to be my best friend." (The referents for "*All this characteristic*" are unclear. The cognitive level is more likely to be that of level 3 as there is an attempt to relate the topic to oneself).

Now we will look at the sentences in the order the student wrote.

Ex. 3.1:

"(1) In my opinion I agree with him about how is important the friend in the life and characteristic. (2) Best friend should be smart to face any problem or situation. (3) For example, if there any misunderstand, she can solve this problem. (4) She should be not shy. (5) This will help her to deal with people especially when she meet a new people. (6) All this characteristic make me I chose this person to be my best friend." (PN.58.D) (in relation to the use of italics henceforth, see Table 3.7, item 3.a).

Even with the grammatical mistakes, this text has more meaning as there is some level of cohesion that makes it more meaningful than just reading the sentences as isolated units of

meaning. Therefore, it emphasises that analysing the texts as separate sentences might cause problems in assigning them proper coding. Unfortunately, studies on reader responses and reflective journals did not explain the nature of the difficulty the researchers had in assigning their coding in cases such as these.

2. Presence of different levels of cognition in texts: Another problem of analytical approach was how to deal with texts that included sentences representing different levels of cognitive engagement. This actually relates to the reliability of coding. The issue of reliability of coding is important in qualitative studies such as this particular study. There have been different approaches in addressing this issue. According to Dyment and O'Connell (2011) who examined 11 articles on reflective journals, the approach taken by the researchers has not been unified. Some used only one rater, while others used 2 or more to rate the level of reflection in student journals (e.g., Plack et al, 2007; Sparks-Langer et al, 1990; Wallman et al, 2008). Dyment and O'Connell emphasise the difficulty in reaching an agreement between raters. In studies with two or more raters, whenever the raters did not agree on a rating assessment, they would discuss it and try to find a rating that they would agree on (Plack et al, 2007; Wallman et al, 2008), or they would accept a one-level difference as an acceptable rating (Sparks-Langer et al, 1990). That is what Dyment and O'Connell describe as a hurdle in rating reflective journals because what a journal writer means might be differently interpreted by the reader especially if more than one assessor is involved. This, they argue, explains the vast differences between the inter-rater reliability.

In coding these 10 texts, my colleague and I noticed that sometimes only one or two sentences were from higher levels but the rest were not. Therefore, deciding on what code to allocate for each text was a problem. However, using the holistic approach, we could look at the whole text as one unit and decide on the dominant impression that we got from the text. That is, for cases when there is only one (in short texts) or two sentences (in longer texts) among the others that might belong to a category level different from the rest of the text, they were considered as belonging to the same category level as the rest. For instance, in the example mentioned above (Ex.3.1), the whole text demonstrates the interpretational attempts of the writer (level 2) except for the last sentence, where the writer shows her connection to the topic (level 3), which is also as an extra piece of information. Therefore, the text was considered as showing level 2 cognition. However, when texts have sentences belonging to different levels of cognition,

we decided to focus on the purpose of the writer. If the writer was trying to make a case for some arguments (as seen in level 4 cognition), then the text would be considered belonging to the higher level of engagement even if only 1-2 sentences belonged to that category. After deciding on these issues, it was easier for us to assign a cognitive category to the texts.

The example below illustrates a text containing multi-level cognitive involvement.

Ex. 3.2:

"(1) I agree with the writer about the harm of smoking. (2) Cigarette has many harmful substance such as toxic and nicotine. (3) Also it make a lot of disease such as heart attack and cancer. (4) For example, my father last year had a heart attack because he smoke a lot of cigarette in a day but now he stops smoke and I pride for his choice. (5) In my opinion the government should prevent sale cigarette everywhere. (6) I think if the government put strong law to prevent smoking the smoker will stop smoke easily." (PN.60.B)

Sentences 1-3 belong to the lower levels of 1 and 2 (*narration*, *interpretational*) while sentence 4 can be placed in level 3 (*self and other involvement*) and sentences 5 and 6 fall into the highest level, 4 (*prescriptive judgment*). However, analysing this text holistically allows us to place it at the highest category because the writer is using lower levels of categories to arrive at a point, the role of the government in preventing this social problem.

3. Insufficient language proficiency: The third problem with using analytical coding was related to some of these EFL students' insufficient English knowledge, something that has been similarly observed by many other researchers (e.g., Chang, 2006; Ferris, 1994; Johns, 1991; Weigle, 2002). One area of this weakness focussed on the composition of faulty sentence structures by some students of lower language proficiency levels and another area of weakness related to their limited vocabulary knowledge.

Use of fragment, run-on, or comma splice sentences made it difficult for us to do analytical coding. We would have had to edit the texts before coding the sentences. The danger of this approach was that it could have affected the integrity of the students' texts. Additionally, the circumstances determining the coding were less than ideal as it depended on our assumption of what the writer meant to say by such a fragment or run-on sentence. However, using a holistic approach could be a more efficient way to handle this issue by focusing on the content and not on the form of the sentences. The following text can illustrate this type of problem.

Ex. 3.3:

"(1) In my opinion, when I read any books especially literary novels. (2) I feel that I am living another life besides my own life. (3) Reading books give me the summary of what the life is going to be and how I can contract with it. (4) Reading books teach us how we can deal with any difficulty may we face? (5) Reading books give the Pearson who read a background of life instead of starting his or her life from the zero, reading books increase our knowledge about anything. (6) In conclusion, reading books give us the fun and knowledge." (PM.23.D)

As can be seen, sentence 1 is a fragment and needs to be joined to sentence 2. Sentence 4 is not a question and sentence 5 has a comma splice problem. This example shows the type of problems that the coder may face using an analytical form of coding. In fact, an investigation into these kinds of problems showed that they were mostly seen in texts of pre-nursing group, who had a relatively low English proficiency level. Table 3.4 shows the number of texts in each student group and in each cognitive level that had fragment, run-on or comma splice problems. The number in brackets is the number of mistakes. Other grammatical mistakes have not been considered here.

Table 3.4

Number of Texts with Only One (1) or Two and More (2+) Faulty Sentences

Student Groups	No. of texts of level 1	No. of texts of level 2	No. of texts of level 3	No. of texts of level 4
Pre- nursing	22 (1) 4 (2+)	26 (1) 10 (2+)	12 (1) 6 (2+)	1 (2+)
Total no. of text/total no. of texts of each level	26 / 95 = 27.3%	36/ 123= 29%	18/ 70= *25.7%*	1/ 11= *9%*
Pre-med	4 (1) 2 (2+)	20 (1) 13 (2+)	32 (1) 14 (2+)	2 (1) 1 (2+)
Total no. of text/total no. of texts of each level	6/ 34= *17.6%*	33/ 125= *26.4%*	46/129= *35.6%*	3/13= *23%*
Grand total	32/129= 24.8%	69/248= *27.8%*	64/199= *32.1%*	4/24= *16.6%*
Grand total	169 texts of all cognitive levels/600 grand total= *28.1%*			

The table shows that from the total of 600 student texts, 169 (28.1%) had faulty sentences. This further shows the difficulty of coding the texts if we had opted for the analytical method because then we would have needed to edit the texts and make the necessary changes to them in order to prepare them for analytical coding. That would create another problem, assuming what the student intended to convey (Dyment & O'Connell, 2011). Another point is

that to be able to edit the work, we had to read the whole text (holistic approach) to be able to understand the message and then make the changes, which further supports the use of a holistic approach in coding texts.

Another area of insufficient language proficiency concerned lexical deficiencies. Handling sentences with wrong word usage and using the analytical approach would mean guessing what the student was trying to say. However, using a holistic approach, this deficiency, although affecting the meaning negatively, would not necessarily distort the overall message the students intended to convey. The above student response (Ex. 3.3, PM.23.D) illustrates this problem ("*the summary of*", "*contract*", "*background of life*" in sentences 3 and 5). However, in spite of having wrong vocabulary usages, the writer was able to convey the message. Therefore, having a holistic approach would not only enable us to pay attention to the message of the text but would also assist us in arriving at the possible meaning of the used word.

After observing all these difficulties with analytical coding in the piloted sample, my colleague and I decided that the holistic coding was a more practical choice. Holistic coding also had concurrent theoretical support (e.g., Halliday & Hasan, 1976). I utilised the rating method used by Seng (2004) to overcome the problem in consistency in rating and inter-rater agreement. That is, I rated the next 20 texts once. After a month, I rated 10 of these 20 texts once more. The inter-rater agreement between the first and the second time ratings was 70%. I continued with the coding of the next 10 texts in the second round and the results of the first and the second rounds of rating were compared. There was agreement with the ratings 90% of the time. By this time, I had a firm grasp of what each category of response involved. Some example responses drawn from a range of categories were chosen to help guide me in the appropriate coding of the student responses for this study. Also, the same colleague helped me in coding 10% of the texts (60 texts out of 600) in this study. The agreement between our coding was 91.66%. The five cases that we had disagreed on had only one level difference, so we opted for the higher code (Sparks-Langer et al, 1990; Wallman et al, 2008). Since the inter-rater agreement was high, I continued with the coding of the remainder of the texts (510 responses) independently.

3.5 The Coding Categories of Cognitive Levels of Engagement and Their Specification

To evaluate the levels of cognitive involvement with the reading texts, the model formulated as particularised earlier (Table 2.13) was used. To be able to assign the codes for

each cognitive level appropriately, descriptors for the response types were developed as set out hereunder (Table 3.5).

Table 3.5

Description of Levels of Cognitive Involvement

Category of responses based on cognitive levels	Description
1. Narration and literal judgment (no reason is given)	Closely matching ideas identified by comparing the original text and the student text, all ideas are taken from the reading text
2. Interpretational and simple evaluation (reason is given)	Evidence of analysis of ideas in the reading texts, simple reasons, combining the textual information with one's world knowledge and prior factual knowledge
3. Self and other involvement (other can be a specific group of people)	Evidence of relating the content to oneself or to others
4. Prescriptive judgment (seeing the bigger picture)	Evidence of evaluation, judgment, connecting the content to other broader issues not necessarily mentioned in the reading text, asking for action from the powerful, the government or other authorities

This helped me decide which category each response belonged to. For example, what makes a text to be coded and placed in the *narration and literal judgment* category is determined by closely comparing the original reading text and the student text to check for recurrence of the same ideas without any sign of interpretation from the student. The main element that is helpful in differentiating this type from others is that the writer is just reporting the reading content without any interpretational attempt or bringing her own ideas on the subject from outside the original text for interpretational purposes. There is generally, a great sense of repetition of the textual information that one discerns after reading the original and the student texts.

For the second type, *interpretative and simple reasoning*, the writer uses the content of the reading text and writes about the ideas mentioned. There is an attempt to make sense of the content by focusing on one or more aspects of it and adding a few ideas of her own in order to show the relationship between the ideas in the text. She might rely on her own world or factual knowledge to explain the content and accommodate the new information with the old shared knowledge. The difference of this type with type three, *self and other involvement* is that the interpretation is mostly done by making meaning from the text itself or the writer's prior factual or world knowledge, without showing its relation to herself or to other people. Even if the writer uses the pronouns 'you' or 'we', they are mostly used in their impersonal usage not as 'you' the reader or 'we' as you and me only (use of personal pronouns has been discussed in Chapter 2 and

will be examined in student responses. The methodology in determining these uses and functions are explained later in this chapter). This is also shown in Example 3.4 below, which is a response to an article on the advantages of canned food. The student disagrees with the author and in one of the sentences writes:

Ex. 3.4

"*Always fresh thing are better because if they don't benefit you they won't harm you."* (PM.59.B) (for more, see the original reading text and the student full text presented later in Table 4.9).

The third category, *self and other involvement*, although involving interpretational efforts, has an element of application. The writer tries to make sense of the content by applying or relating it to her own life or life of significant others. The following example of a student response to an article on friendship illustrates this.

Ex. 3.5:

"I think everyone must to have best friend in his life because, the best friend always understand us without talking. Also, the best friends have similar characters with us. The last time I saw my best friend (jojo) before two years because she study in Dammam but, I am sure the long distance doesn't change the strong relationship between best friends. We always share secrets and talk about problems in our lives and try to find fit solutions; I think the best friends are the best thing happened in our live and we can't live without them." (PN.6.B) (in relation to the use of underlining in this text and in similar cases henceforth, see Table 3.7, item 5.b).

The first sentence states the student's agreement with the author and emphasises the importance of friends and then presents a reason to explain her point of view. Then she moves to the application of this proposition and relates the concept of best friend to her own life and her own best friend. The difference between this type of text with the fourth type, *prescriptive judgment,* is that in the latter, the writer goes beyond relating the content to herself or others and tries to put the pieces of a puzzle beside each other. She connects the ideas in the text to broader social, political, economic and ethical issues. Example 3.2 mentioned above (PN.60.B) is a good illustration of this. The student starts by making some general statements about smoking and then moves to relating it to herself (her father's smoking). She then places the problem in a bigger picture, sale of cigarettes in her society, and calls for government's preventative action.

This example also shows different cognitive levels of engagement with the reading passage. The textual characteristics of texts of different cognitive levels and examples of student responses will be discussed in the next chapter. In the next section, I will discuss some complications that I faced analysing texts and how the patterns that emerged from my analysis helped me to categorise the responses.

3.5.1 A Challenge in text analysis of the reader responses.

Although it was explained earlier in justifying the use of a holistic method instead of an analytical one when analysing texts, at times, it was still challenging to decide which level of cognition the text could be categorised under. The challenge was most apparent when categorising texts showing elements of different cognitive levels (multi-levelled) and those that displayed extensive use of personal pronouns. The following explains this.

3.5.2 Determining the usage of personal pronouns.

As mentioned above, determining the usage of personal pronouns in texts was an important factor in deciding the level of cognitive involvement. In the Literature Review Chapter, the findings of many studies that examined personal pronoun usages were presented (e.g., Chang, 2014; Fortanet, 2004; Harwood, 2005; Hrisonopulo, 2007; Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990; Kuo, 1999; Okamura, 2009; Yeo & Ting, 2014). However, for the purpose of this study and to be able to categorise the usage of personal pronouns, I used Kitagawa and Lehrer's (1990) categorisation in which the usages of personal pronouns are divided into three categories: personal (referential), impersonal (non-referential), and vague. This broad typology would give me more flexibility in categorisation of the personal pronouns as many other typologies (e.g., Okamura, 2009) would not have that relevance to this type of task (written reader responses). Also, since reader response genre has not been explored before, the use of a broad categorisation can better serve the purpose.

The procedure to use was that if the pronouns used in a reader response were referring to the speaker (I), a specific group of people (we) or to the addressee(s) (you), then they could be classified under level 3 cognitive involvement, provided the text message also related to self and others involvement. However, if these pronouns were used in their impersonal usage, and considering the meaning of the text as well, the text could be categorised under level 2 (interpretation). This was especially evident when the students brought evidence of their world knowledge (e.g., "*As we know*, *children need love and attention."*), prior knowledge (e.g., *"We*

know that the Ozone layer is damaged and scientists have been trying to find ways to repair it."), as a moral of a story (e.g., *"We should always tell the truth even if it harms us."*), or as a piece of advice (e.g., *"You should always choose your friends carefully."*) (in relation to the use of underlining of the pronouns henceforth, see Table 3.7, item 5.c).

Therefore, the student scripts needed to be examined thoroughly for the usage of the personal pronouns. The following text (Ex. 3.6), a pre-nursing student's response to the story *The Boy Who Cried Wolf,* shows this difficulty.

Ex. 3.6:

"The writer showed us that lying can easily break the trust. There is no one wants to be friend with a liar. We don't believe liar even when he speaks the truth." (PN.19.B)

This short response has only 3 sentences. The use of pronouns *us* and *we* in this response might make us think that it shows level 3 of cognitive involvement (*self and other involvement*) by referring to students; however, it could be argued that they are used in their impersonal usage as all people and not a specific group of people and for interpretational purposes (level 2). When we read the original text and the response, we understand that the student used these pronouns to show her understanding of the text, her interpretation (level 2). Her world knowledge of beliefs held universally by people led her to draw a conclusion as evidenced in the third sentence. She is not referring to any specific groups of people but to people in general. So overall, this response was classified under level 2.

Now we compare Example 3.6 with Example 3.7 below, a response to a reading text about stress.

Ex. 3.7:

"It is well-known that the problem of stress is a common problem that people of different ages and social classes suffer from. Therefore, we must learn the ways to cope with it which leads us to eradicate the problem completely. Managing stress is not an easy thing to do. We must know how to keep stress under control and succeed in our studying." (PM.1.D) (see Table 3.7, item 6, for the use of double underlining here and in similar cases afterwards).

In this response, the student uses the pronouns 'we', 'us', and 'our'. However, the question is whether these pronouns are in their personal usage referring to the writer and others in a specific group or to people or all human beings in general (impersonal usage). After examining the text more thoroughly, I noticed that unlike the pronouns used in the first example,

in this instance, the writer is using these pronouns to refer to specific groups of people (exclusive-we). What makes these pronouns to show the student is referring to 'we' as a specific group of people and not 'we' as human being is the use of the word studying. This word makes it clear that she is referring to the students and therefore, she is relating the content to herself and other students (level 3).

After explaining the methodology in determining the level of cognitive engagement, I now move on to discuss the methodology in dealing with the other part of research question 2, the generic structuring of reader responses.

3.6 Methodology in Exploring the Generic Structure of Reader Responses

The second part of the research question 2 relates to the generic characteristics of reader responses. Having discussed the relationship between reading, writing and thinking (in Chapter 2), and developing a model for assessing and describing students' levels of cognitive involvement, the next question is what generic characteristics these responses have if any, and what is the relationship between texts of different cognitive levels and their generic structure.

As mentioned earlier, most genre studies have been done on public genres (e.g., Swales, 1990) and on texts mostly written by experts (e.g., Hyland, 2002). Although some studies have been done on student essays (e.g., Hyland, 1990; Gecikli, 2013; Katajamaki & Koskela, 2006; Liu, 2015; Menezes, 2013; Mohsenzadeh, 2013; Suarez & Moreno, 2006; Yang, 2009), to the best of my knowledge there is no genre analysis of reader responses. However, reviewing some genre studies (e.g., opinion genres, essay genre) helped me in deciding on the methodology to use for this purpose, which will be discussed in the next section.

We have to remember that the findings of this study will be reflective of EFL students' writing of this genre. Another point to remember is that the students in this study were instructed to write a summary paragraph of each reading text (a paragraph or more) and write their response to it by expressing their opinion or reflecting on the reading text. This was the only instruction they were given. There were no prompts to direct their attention to specific features of the reading texts, nor was there any attempt at teaching them what or how to write their responses. This was done based on the assumption that students, especially those in advanced English courses, should have an idea of what an opinion text entailed. Indeed, some researchers argue that students have a relatively accurate idea of what a genre looks like. Gardner and Nesi (2013) affirm that how 'occluded genres' emerge and are established is not known as students might not

have had any access to the exemplars of those genres. However, it is reasonable to presume that any new genre (in the initial stage of higher education) is likely to be a transformation of a school genre, influenced perhaps by the rhetorical patterns of instructional materials. They believe that course outlining and writing prompts may not in fact play much of a part in genre formation, particularly if they are not explanatory enough to be of value in informing the novice writer (p.18).

In the same vein, some other researchers argue that genres do not have to be taught to the students. Freedman (1993, as cited in Dawarshi & Reiff, 2010) believes that it is not necessary or practical to teach genres because students learn them indirectly and internalise them. In Freedman's study, the students were able to produce narratives of good quality although they had not learned them directly. However, since they had exposure to narrative and heard them, they apparently internalised and accessed them to reconstruct a narrative in a similar situation. She concluded that students/learners approached the task with a 'dimly felt sense' of the new genre they were working on. They started writing by first focusing on the context to be placed in the genre. The 'dimly felt sense' is given a shape, as this sense, coupled with the process of writing and production of the text, interrelate and modify one another. Then based on the external factors (e.g., teacher feedback or peer review and comments), students can update their understanding of the genre or confirm it. She believes that the students' broad schema of their academic setting requirements and activities assist them to interpret new genres and that by drawing on their learned genres, they accomplish the task that the new genre requires, although if students are developmentally at the right stage, teaching genres will be beneficial.

In the case of students in this study and the subjective nature of this genre, relying on student's 'dimly felt sense' of reader response genre seemed to be an acceptable assumption. Therefore, the result of this genre analysis should be viewed in the light of how students felt a reader response genre should be.

3.6.1 Use of other related genres.

As I was not able to find any study on reader response genre, using Bhatia's (1997) explanation about the hierarchy of genres I decided to look at the super-genre (opinion genre) that reader response genre belongs to and its sub-genres (e.g., book blurbs, commentary) in order to understand what characteristics and properties I might be able to find in my data (e.g., Cacchiani, 2007; Ledema et al, 1994; Motta-Roth, 1998; Mugumya, 2013; Salmani Nodoshan &

Montazeran, 2012; Suarez & Moreno, 2006). Besides reviewing this type of genre, I also reviewed the literature on student essay genre to gain insight for the analysis of genre of reader responses here (e.g., Afful, 2010; Henry & Roseberry, 1997; Hyland, 1990; Kusel, 1992; Yang, 2009). In the opinion sub-genres, it seems that as Bhatia (1997) mentioned, although they share the same communicative purpose with the genre but differ in their contextual factors (medium, audience, tenor,..) which apparently affects their generic structure. For example, while newspaper editorials, commentaries, book reviews, and book blurbs all share the purpose of introducing a topic and evaluating it, their generic structures vary. For example, the newspaper editorials have 3 moves, but the book reviews have 5 (for more refer to Chapter 2, Section 5). Compared to the opinion genres, essay genres seem to be more alike by having 3 main moves (introduction, body of the argument, and conclusion).

To be able to analyse the data for signs of a rhetorical structure that would in turn lend themselves to a conclusion about the genre of the reader response texts, all 600 student responses were carefully examined. It was clear that a simple rhetorical structure could be detected in many texts of about 60 words and more (5-6 sentences). The texts with fewer than 60 words consisted of one or a few sentences that did not have any rhetorical structure as the ideas were not developed. Therefore, it was decided to select all texts of 60 words and more for inclusion in the analysis, excluding any texts with less than 60 words as they did not have any potential to reveal a rhetorical structure. The total number of texts having 60 words and more was 378 texts out of overall 600 texts (63.6% of all student texts). For finding the rhetorical patterns, all texts included in the study (378 texts) were manually analysed. The approach in genre analysis was the Swales' move analysis theory. 'Move' was understood as discoursal meaningful unit that performs a distinct function which can also have constituting steps as an avenue to realise the move (Swales, 1990).

3.7 Coding of the Rhetorical Moves

As for the coding of the moves and the steps, I coded them once and then asked one of my colleagues, who is an Assistance Professor in Applied Linguistics whose PhD dissertation was on corpus studies and was therefore familiar with Swales' move theory and genre analysis, to help me with a second round of coding. We had disagreed on three occasions in the coding of the moves and five occasions in deciding the type of the step. We resolved these disagreements by analysing and discussing them further and keeping or changing the assigned code.

An example of disagreements in the coding of the moves was when there was no clear boundary (i.e. use of some linguistic clues) to show the end or start of a move. Also, the other disagreements regarding the steps related to their type. The table below shows two student texts about which there were disagreements.

Table 3.6

Types of Problems Encountered in Coding of the Moves

Start/end of a move	Type of the step
Reading *"Reading supply the mind by a huge amount of information. Reading improves many skills, and anyone can get it and get developed more when he/she exercises more in order to become a good reader. When we talk about reading, we don't mean just reading books. But also newspapers and magazines are also considered as sources of knowledge. There are many reasons make us read more such as education reasons, wasting our time in a good way, or it can be for pleasure. A person who reads more often is able to talk freely, and he/she has more self-confident than other people."* (PN.5.C)	Exercise *"Exercise in general is very important for each one, however, it becomes much more important for the pregnancy. In my view, the topic of pregnancy exercise one of the most important issue in the world because it will support many women's so the pregnancy should keep safe their body and the birth as well, and exercise will be half; at the time of delivery. Finally, this topic will be important for the knowledge of the women's."* (PN.31.E)

In the first example (Reading), the first sentence is the *Introductory Move* which focuses on the benefits of reading. The writer tries to explain this point in greater detail in the next sentence. Next, she moves to types of reading materials (sentences 3-4), and then talks about reasons for reading (sentence 5). The last sentence does not have any marker to signal it as a conclusion. It could easily be assumed that it is another piece of information that the writer might want to mention, still as a part of the second move. However, after analysing it further and knowing that the last sentence is about the result of reading, and also knowing that focusing on a result or results is an acceptable way for concluding a text (e.g., Oshima & Hogue, 2007), we decided to consider this as a new move, the *Conclusion Move*.

In the second example (Exercise), sentence one is the *Introductory Move*, but the type of step used can be considered either a *general statement* or *taking sides* (for further explanation on all introductory steps and their features refer to the next chapter). The argument for considering it as the *general statement* was that it was talking about exercise in general (use of the adverbial phrase in general) and its importance during pregnancy in particular. After rereading the original reading text, we noticed that the focus of the reading text was mainly on exercising during

pregnancy. So we decided to consider this as a *taking sides* step as the writer was taking the author's side and supporting the content (author's argument). Use of however was also an indicator that the focus was on a specific group of people and not all, and the clause '*it becomes much more important for the pregnancy'* being in the rhyme position (new information) accentuated it as being the focus of discussion or argument.

To find the interplay of the characteristics of the student texts (cognitive levels and generic structure), files of student texts were created according to the level of cognitive engagement and generic structure of student response in each cognitive level was examined. After discussing the methodology for the second question of this study, I now turn to the last research question, that of the role of students as writers as presented in their respective texts.

3.8 Methodology in Addressing the Research Question 3

The last question of this study concerns the role of students as creators of their own texts and how they use personal pronouns for self-representation and engaging the readers and what rhetorical functions these pronouns perform in the texts. After reviewing the literature on the usages and functions of personal pronouns (see Chapter 2), it was found that the use of personal pronouns in the reader response has not been explored before. Therefore, it appeared necessary to use Kitagawa and Lehrer's (1990) broad categorisation of personal pronoun usages as a starting point. Using the literature on personal pronouns and their functions identified by researchers (e.g., Hyland, 2005; Ivanič & Camps, 2001; Kuo, 1999; Tang & John, 1999; Thonney, 2013), it was clear that there is a relationship between the pronoun functions, especially those of first and second persons, and the author's identity (their beliefs, their state of being and having for the first person pronouns, or for the engagement of the readers in case of second person pronouns). For instance, when the students expressed their opinion as " We believe….", depending on the context the 'we' might refer to students or Saudis, which would make it a personal usage, or to human beings, an impersonal usage; however, their functions can be to express an opinion ('opinion-holder', Tang & John, 1999) or to direct the reader in an argument (Hyland, 2001, 2005) or other such functions.

In this exploratory study, I used the previously found rhetorical functions of personal pronouns for categorisations of these pronouns, keeping in mind that some new functions might be found for them in this genre.

3.8.1 Determining the Uses and Rhetorical Functions of Personal Pronouns

As mentioned above, although some of the roles and functions of writer authorial self or identity mentioned earlier in the Literature Review Chapter (e.g., Ivanič, 1997, as cited in Rodriguez et al, 2011; Tang & John, 1999, Thonney, 2013) might be drawn on to analyse the reader responses (e.g., 'the opinion holder', 'the representative of a specific groups of people'), there are some roles and functions that are not applicable to reader responses (e.g., 'explaining a methodology', 'making a claim', 'organising the text'). Therefore, the findings of other studies could be helpful as starting points, yet it is necessary to devise a separate account for pronoun use in reader responses. The added dimension this research brings is the relationship between pronoun use and rhetorical functions and cognitive levels of engagement.

To have a better understanding of the writers' ways of self-representation and engaging the readers and what rhetorical characteristics they had, I used both quantitative and qualitative methods. To find the frequency of these pronouns, I used the KWIC Concordancer tool, which is available online. All student texts qualified for inclusion in this study (texts of more than 60 words) were turned into txt* files (without any editing), uploaded onto this tool in separate files according to the four cognitive levels (as established earlier in the thesis), and frequencies of first and second person pronouns were calculated. Since the frequency of the personal pronouns in their subjective form (I, we, you) was more than their other forms (possessive, objective, ..), it was decided to analyse only the subjective forms of these pronouns. Using this concordancer's collocation tool also helped in providing important information on determining the functions of the pronouns.

In addition to the quantitative method, I used the qualitative method by analysing the student texts manually. Considering texts as a 'semantic unit' (Halliday & Hasan, 1976) in which writers create meaning and show their authorial self for different purposes (e.g., Ivanič & Camps, 2001; Tang & John, 1999) and engage the readers (e.g., Hyland, 2001), the manual analysis of the texts would assist me in finding the rhetorical functions that these personal pronouns had in the texts. It would also be informative to investigate whether the rhetorical functions found were similarly seen in all texts or their presence and functions changed according to the cognitive levels the texts belonged to.

3.8.2 Coding Procedure

At first, I did a preliminary analysis of both usages and functions of the texts to see what I would find. While analysing the student texts, it became clear that besides the functions already found in the studies on pronouns, there were some that were more prominent in the genre of reader response and needed their own separate labelling. For example, the function of the *expressing an opinion* could be said to encompass a number of statements from those clearly stating agreement or disagreement with a proposition (e.g., I agree with the author; I am against…) to those statements that advise or warn about something or its consequence. Therefore, the focus was on labelling all different functions that these pronouns specifically performed (see Section 3 of the next chapter for all the rhetorical functions of these pronouns).

I did an initial coding of the instances of pronoun usages and functions as I analysed the data and created a list of functions for these pronouns in each cognitive level. Once discourse functions were identified, I asked one of my colleagues who is an Assistant Professor in Applied Linguistics and has been teaching grammar courses in our college for more than ten years to help me in coding categorisation for 30% of the texts in each cognitive level. We were consistent in 90% of coding categorisation and for those that we had differences of opinion on, it was solved by looking at the instance more thoroughly and reading and rereading the whole text to have a better sense of the function that the related pronoun had.

We also noticed that sometimes it seemed that there was an overlap between some functions. We decided that to determine the appropriate function (coding) it was important to know which one had more dominancy. For example, the function of *mentioning a personal quality or an experience* might be seen in the context where the writer uses the personal pronoun 'I' to function as *being recipient of an effect of reading*. When instances such as these occurred, the function that had more force and overshadowed the other was the one that had the dominant presence and therefore was considered to be the main function. The extract below illustrates this point.

Ex. 3.8:

"Before knowing the side effects of drinking too much green tea, I used to drink it more than twice a day…… . Nowadays, after I became aware of the side effects of drinking too much green tea, I reduced the amount to one or two cups a day and it is still helping me to be active through the day. Therefore, green tea will be always my favorite." (PM.56.D)

The writer used the *Mentioning a personal quality or an experience* function when she mentioned "*I used to drink"*, but then she used the function of *Being the recipient of an effect of reading* on herself by saying "*after I became aware"* and its consequence "*I reduced"*. Therefore, the function of "*I reduced"* could be *Mentioning a personal quality or an experience,* but considering the context, talking about *the effects of reading*, it was categorised under *Being the recipient of an effect from reading* (for categories of rhetorical functions of these pronouns refer to Section 3 of Chapter 4). After we did the coding of 30% of the texts of each cognitive level together and had some descriptors on what each code can contain, I continued with the coding of the rest of the texts on my own.

It was found that there were different ways that writers used personal pronouns to show themselves in their texts and engage the readers. I divided the rhetorical functions of each pronoun according to the purpose of usage. For instance, for pronoun 'we', I found eight rhetorical functions of *Interpretation*, *Advising*, *Warning*, *Enquiring*, *Predicting*, *Ability*, *Wishing* and *Criticising* (in relation to the use of italics with notions henceforth refer to Table 3.7, item 3.b). Some of these types might have their own sub-divisions. For example, the function of *Interpretation* was usually in form of *shared knowledge* (either *world knowledge* or *scientific knowledge*), *shared experience,* or *explanation* (The rhetorical functions of pronouns with their divisions and sub-divisions will be discussed in Section 3 of Chapter 4).

3.8.3 Creating Concordancer Lines Showing the Use of Personal Pronouns

For an easier reference to the uses and functions of these personal pronouns in student texts, I collected and typed all instances of these pronoun usages in form of concordancer lines (see Appendix N). However, since it was felt that having more contextual clues would help us better understand the pronoun's discourse function, I tried to adjust the concordancer lines so that some more clues to the usage could be included in the line, and not just typical concordancer lines that one sees with the key words all showing lined up in one place (usually in the centre). Usage of the pronoun whenever applicable was indicated by a code inside brackets at the end of each concordancer line (e.g., (E) means Exclusive-we and (I) Inclusive-we). Below is an example of some concordancer lines showing the use of the pronoun 'we' in texts of level 2 cognition categorised under the function of *Interpretation* and under its subdivision of *shared experience*:

We all have problems in our life no one except. But (I)
We live in a big world which people speak different (I)
it is what we look up to. The respect is the values that we born (I)
The respect is the values that we born on it or in other word it is our believe in (I)
And just as we would use sunscreen to protect ourselves from sun (E)
We originally learn from our parent by copying their (I)

3.9 Notations Used throughout the Thesis

In addition to observing the recommended conventions of academic writing, I employed different notations to highlight words, texts or parts of a particular text in this thesis. The following table particularises these notations and their specific usages.

Table 3.7

Use of Different Notations in This Thesis

Notations	Usage
1. Inverted commas	a. Highlighting the word(s) used by an author(s) in a published work b. Around personal pronouns (I, we, you) as subjects of study and discussion
2. Quotation marks	Signalling student texts (responses), whether as a whole or as part of a response
3. Italicising	a. Student responses/texts placed inside quotation marks b. My own terms for labelling the findings of this study (e.g., reading topics, types of moves, steps, conclusions, rhetorical functions etc.)
4. Boldfacing	Showing words/segments of a text as linguistic cues in original reading texts
5. Single underlining	a. Highlighting shared notions between findings of different studies b. Stressing a particular section of a student text having a certain feature c. Showing the use of personal pronouns being discussed in students' texts
6. Double underlining	Showing key words/segments in student texts helping the codification

Having explained extensively the methodological approaches taken in this study, I will now proceed to the results and discussions in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 4
RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In the following sections, the findings related to each research question are presented and discussed. Section 1 relates to results regarding research question one, Section 2 focuses on research question two, and Section 3 presents the findings on research question three.

SECTION 1

4.1 Reading Topics of Interest, Role of Discipline in Topic Selection and Role of Topic on Student Responses

The first question of this research concerns the following: what reading topics these Saudi EFL students choose to read when given a choice, how their discipline affects their choice, and how their choice affects the quality (length) of their responses. In the following, I will discuss the results for each part of this question.

4.1.1 Topics chosen by the students.

As mentioned in the Methodology Chapter, there were six broad categories of topics that these students' self-selected reading topics belonged to: *Education*, *Health*, *Literature*, *Psychology*, *Society*, and *Environment*.

The following table shows what reading topics these students were interested to read.

Table 4.1

Frequency of Reading Topics in the Sample as Whole

	Topics	Frequency	Percent
Valid	Education	54	9.0
	Health	215	35.8
	Literature	99	16.5
	Psychology	91	15.2
	Society	121	20.2
	Environment	20	3.3
	Total	600	100.0

As the table shows, while one-third of all reading topics was on *Health*, a significant portion of the topics belonged to the topic of *Society* (20%), followed by *Literature* and *Psychology* (16.3% and 15.2% respectively). The fifth ranked topic was *Education* and the last

was *Environment*. Overall, this result is not consistent with Yu et al's study (2008, as cited in Xiaoping, 2011) on Chinese students who ranked topics related to their daily life such as friendship, success, and career to be the ones they would be interested to read more keenly. Also, it is unlike the findings of Al Jurf (2004) which showed 77% of female Saudi students in her study read light women's magazines on topics that were advertised in satellite channels. The result is somewhat similar to Xiaoping's (2011) findings on Chinese students where they showed interest in the above six topics among their 10 topics of reading. Unlike Al-Kutob's study where the Kuwaiti students showed interest in topics on religion as their first choice, in this study there was no such purely a religious topic that these students chose to read; however, sometimes they would relate the topic (whether *Health, Society* or others) to a religious point or view it from the perspective of religion (Islam). Like Al-Kutob's study, students here chose topics of *Literature* and *Society* as their second and third choices. Another interesting finding was that unlike male Saudi students in Al-Nafisah and Al-Shorman' study (2010), and female Saudi students in Al Musallam's study (2009), the students in this study did not choose any specific sport topic to read. They chose topics related to exercising in general but not on a specific sport such as football, volleyball or others. This might be related to their family or cultural beliefs (especially those on gender roles) which prevented them from having any interest in this topic, at least in the context of this study. Also, the overall results is mostly in accordance with Al Musallam's findings (2009) on female Saudi EFL learners in which the participants showed interests in topics such as world news, education, health, sports, and fashion (except for the sports).

One important observation is that while educationists advocate the use of literature as an approach for teaching reading and writing (e.g., Kellem, 2009; Lareaus et al, 2006; Liaw, 2001; Rosenblatt, 1978), we can see that given a choice, students may prefer to read on other topics apart from literary works. This emphasises the importance of adopting a student-centred approach when it comes to selecting a learning activity for students.

4.1.2 Impact of discipline and choice of topics.

For the second part of the research question one, which evaluates the impact of discipline on the choice of topics, it seems that there is a difference between these two student groups. Table 4.2 shows the frequency of the reading topics in each student group (specialty) and within the topic.

Table 4.2

Frequency of Reading Topics in Each Student Group

Speciality		topic_no						
		Education	Health	Litera-ture	Psycho-logy	Society	Environ-ment	Total
pre-med	Count	26	136	22	57	57	2	300
	% within speciality	8.7%	45.3%	7.3%	19.0%	19.0%	.7%	100.0%
	% within topic_no	48.1%	63.3%	22.2%	62.6%	47.1%	10.0%	50.0%
pre-nursing	Count	28	79	77	34	64	18	300
	% within speciality	9.3%	26.3%	25.7%	11.3%	21.3%	6.0%	100.0%
	% within topic_no	51.9%	36.7%	77.8%	37.4%	52.9%	90.0%	50.0%
Total	Count	54	215	99	91	121	20	600
	% within speciality	9.0%	35.8%	16.5%	15.2%	20.2%	3.3%	100.0%
	% within topic_no	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

We can see that while the reading topics on *Health* were the most chosen ones in both groups, their frequencies were different. Whereas in the pre-med group it comprised 45.3% of all reading topics, in the pre-nursing it was only 26.3%, a very close percentage to the second most frequent topic of *Literature* (25.7%) in this group. The second most chosen topics for the pre-med group were *Psychology* and *Society* (19% each) while in the pre-nursing it was *Literature* (25.7%). While *Society* ranked second in the pre-med group, in the pre-nursing it ranked third. Topic of *Psychology* had a lower frequency in the pre-nursing group too (11.3%). The result on the topic of *Literature* was interesting since 25.7% of the pre-nursing students chose this, while only 7.3% of the pre-med did so. Use of literature as a classroom activity for teaching language has been argued for and has its place in ELT (e.g., Kellem, 2009; Lareaus et al, 2006; Liaw, 2001; Rosenblatt, 1978). In this study, we see that the ranking of *Literature* in the pre-nursing group is consistent with Al-Kutob's (1981, as cited in Al-Nafisah & Al-Shorman) findings on the Kuwaiti students' preference for literature, but its ranking (fourth) in the pre-med group is not. The high occurrence of this topic in the pre-nursing group might be due to their linguistic

abilities. This group, having a lower language proficiency level than the pre-med group might have found stories more at the level of their understanding. This might be explained by Vorenberg's (2011) assertion that our brain is wired to comprehend stories better and relate to them. She believes that stories have a facilitating effect on comprehension because of their structure which makes the readers remember, learn from and maintain their motivation in reading. The topic of *Education* had similar frequencies in these two student groups (9.3% in the pre-nursing and 8.7% in the pre-med) while the topic of *Environment* had the least frequency and ranked last in both groups (6% in the pre-nursing and 0.7% in the pre-med). It was a surprising result for this topic as one might assume the pre-med students would be more interested in the environmental topics.

Generally, what these results show is that the most chosen topic was *Health* and the least was *Environment* in both groups. Also, *Education* had a similar frequency in both groups, but the other three topics were chosen differently by these two groups of students probably due to the students' familiarity with the topics (e.g., Chang, 2006; Ji, 2011) or perhaps due to their level of language proficiency.

In order to see whether there was an impact of discipline on the choice of topics a Pearson Chi-Square test (two-sided) was carried out and the result (Table 4.3) showed that the discipline had a significant impact ($p < .05$).

Table 4.3

Relationship between Discipline and Choice of Reading Topics

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	64.759[a]	5	.000
Likelihood Ratio	68.734	5	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	7.174	1	.007
N of Valid Cases	600		

After looking at the frequencies of topics in the sample and each student group (specialty), we now turn to the next part of the research question one which is about the effect of topics on the length of student responses.

4.1.3 Topics and length of responses.

As for the effect of topics on the length of student responses, we will first look at the following table.

Table 4.4

Student Groups and Number of Topics, the Average Number of Words for Each Topic, and the Minimum and Maximum Number of Words in Each Topic

specialty	topic	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
pre-med	Education	26	142.12	65.375	49	389
	Health	136	132.86	72.865	20	493
	Literature	22	182.00	79.859	66	316
	Psychology	57	166.44	88.333	41	489
	Society	57	158.65	92.003	44	593
	Environment	2	50.50	21.920	35	66
	Total	300	148.00	81.198	20	593
pre-nursing	Education	28	64.57	33.257	15	137
	Health	79	50.82	26.272	10	188
	Literature	77	54.84	39.244	5	179
	Psychology	34	77.76	50.140	18	206
	Society	64	54.41	37.021	4	176
	Environment	18	33.11	9.719	17	51
	Total	300	55.89	36.650	4	206
Total	Education	54	101.91	64.101	15	389
	Health	215	102.72	71.920	10	493
	Literature	99	83.10	73.376	5	316
	Psychology	91	133.31	87.392	18	489
	Society	121	103.51	86.022	4	593
	Environment	20	34.85	11.766	17	66
	Total	600	101.95	78.012	4	593

Looking at the sample as a whole, we can see that the average number of words from the least to the most was for the topics of *Environment*, *Literature*, *Education, Health, Society*, and *Psychology*. Also the column showing the minimum length of response displays that the least number of words (4 words) was a response to a topic on *Society,* while the minimum words for a response to a topic of *Psychology* was 18, showing that this topic could possibly produce a higher minimum number of words compared to other topics. The column on the maximum length of responses also shows that except for *Environment* which had a maximum length of 66

words, the rest of the topics had a maximum number of three digits. The longest response was given to a text on *Society* (593 words). An interesting observation about these columns of minimum and maximum words for the whole group is that the texts containing the minimum number of words actually belonged to the pre-nursing group, and those with the maximum number of words belonged to the pre-med. This can be an indicator of the difference in the writing ability of these two groups.

When we look at the length of responses to the topics in each student group, we see that there is a huge difference. In the pre-med group, the mean lengths of responses from the lowest to the highest were for the topics of *Environment*, *Health*, *Education*, *Society*, *Psychology*, and *Literature*. It should be noted that *Environment* being the least chosen topic in this group had the lowest average number of words among the other topics (50.5 words), while *Literature* being the second least chosen topic had the highest average number of words. In the column indicating the minimum number of words, we see that *Literature* had the highest minimum number of words (66) while *Health* had the least (20 words), but in the maximum number of words column, the topic of *Environment* had the least maximum number of words (66 words) and *Society* had the most (593 words). The difference between the minimum and maximum number of words for topics can be due to the student's interest, language proficiency, and the focus of the topic among others (e.g., Abdel Latif, 2008, 2009; Brantmeier, 2003; Cahyono, 2000; Clapham, 2001; Ferris, 1994; Lanauze & Snow, 1989; Reid, 1990).

In the pre-nursing group, on the other hand, we see that the average mean of words from the lowest to the highest were for *Environment*, *Health*, *Society*, *Literature*, *Education*, and *Psychology*. So both groups of students had the lowest mean of words for the topics of *Environment* and *Health*. Also in the pre-nursing group, the column on the average length of responses for the topics shows that the topic of *Psychology* had the highest average (77.76 words) while the lowest was for the topic of *Environment* (33.11 words). As for the minimum number of words in responses, the least words were seen in a response to the topic of *Society* (4 words) and the highest minimum words was seen in a response to the topic of *Psychology* (18 words). In the maximum number of words column, we see that the lowest number was seen for the topic of *Environment* (51 words) while the longest response belonged to a topic on *Psychology* (206 words). An observation was that the topic of *Psychology* had the highest mean of words among the topics (77.76), the highest minimum of words (18 words), and the highest

maximum number of words (206 words). Apparently the pre-nursing students were interested in this topic more and wrote longer responses to it, compared with the other topics.

In order to know whether statistically the difference seen above is significant or not the one-way ANOVA test was done and the result (in Table 4.5) showed that the topic had a significant effect on the length of responses ($p < .05$).

Table 4.5

Relation of Topic and Length of Response

ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	215123.799	5	43024.760	7.450	.000
Within Groups	3430295.386	594	5774.908		
Total	3645419.185	599			

Also, two other tests were run to find out whether a) discipline had any impact on the length of responses (see Model 1 in Table 4.6) and whether b) discipline and topics had any impact on the length of responses (see Model 2 in Table 4.6). In both of these, the result showed that there was a significant relationship ($p < .05$).

Table 4.6

Relationship between Discipline, Topics and Length of Responses

ANOVA[c]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1272453.602	1	1272453.602	320.665	.000
	Residual	2372965.583	598	3968.170		
	Total	3645419.185	599			
2	Regression	1361126.308	6	226854.385	58.891	.000
	Residual	2284292.877	593	3852.096		
	Total	3645419.185	599			

The two disciplines here are pre-med and pre-nursing, both of which consist of students having the same educational background in science, and studying more or less the same courses (at least at the point of this study, the third semester of their studies). However, when we consider the disciplines here as consisting of two groups of students having two different levels of language proficiency (pre-med being more proficient and the pre-nursing as less proficient)

the results have more significance. It has been stated that language proficiency affects SL students' writing performance (Weigle, 2002). Crowhurst (1991, as cited in Chuming, 2005) argues that text length is one of the main indicators of learners' level of writing ability. Abdel Latif (2008, 2009) investigating the effect of EFL students' linguistic knowledge on the length of their composition found that text quality was positively related to linguistic knowledge and to text length. Also those with higher language proficiency demonstrated more composing abilities than the lower proficient group. Other studies have also shown this positive relationship between text length, quality and language proficiency (Al-Mahrooqi, 2011b; Intaraprawat, 1995; Schneider & Connor, 1990; Villanueva, 2008). Similarly, Larsen-Freeman (1978, as cited in Chuming, 2005) found that students who are more competent in writing tend to write longer texts. In a study done by Lanauze and Snow (1989) the students who had good L1 and L2 or good L1 but poor L2 knowledge wrote longer texts than those who had poor L1 and L2 knowledge. So the findings of this study indirectly support the findings of the above studies and others (e.g., Cahyono, 2000; Ferris, 1994) on the effect of language proficiency on text length.

As for the effect of topic on the text length, the finding of this study is in line with what some studies on topic familiarity and text length found. For instance, Ji (2011) found that those students who wrote on a focused, concrete topic besides producing better quality compositions tended to produce longer texts. Similarly, Gradwohl and Schumachier (1989) and Tedick (1988) found that essays on a field-specific topic had better quality than the ones on a general topic. They had a higher mean of T-units and longer texts. Apparently the familiarity with the reading subject allowed the students to produce texts with more fluency, organised structures and contextualisation. The result of this study however, contradicts the findings of those studies that reported no relationship between topic familiarity and text length and text quality (e.g., Kennedy, 1994).

In the next section, the findings related to question two of this study are discussed.

SECTION 2

4.2 Characteristics of Student Responses in Terms of Cognitive Levels and Their Generic Structure

In this section, I discuss the findings for question two of this research (what characterises the student texts in terms of the level of cognitive engagement and their generic structure, and the interplay between cognitive levels and generic structure).

4.2.1 Characteristics of student texts based on levels of cognitive engagement.

After analysing the student responses, it was found that they could be categorised according to the four levels of the cognitive engagement (see Table 2.13); however, the frequency of the response in each category and in each discipline varied. The following table illustrates the findings.

Table 4.7

Number of Texts of Each Group of Students in Each Level of Cognitive Involvement

Cognitive levels	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
Student group	PN	PM	PN	PM	PN	PM	PN	PM
Frequency	95	34	123	125	70	129	11	13
Grand total: 600	129 (21.5%)		248 (41.3%)		199 (33%)		24 (4%)	

It can be seen that overall, most responses (41.3%) showed evidence of level 2 cognition, followed by level 3 (33%), level 1 (21.5%), and level 4 (4%). While majority of responses belonged to levels 2 and 3, level 4 had the least frequency. This variation was seen across the discipline as well. While the frequencies of responses of both student groups were similar in levels 2 and 4 (123, 125 and 11, 13 respectively), a disparity can be seen in the frequency of their responses belonging to levels 1 and 3. The pre-med group produced less level 1 but more level 3 texts. This shows that overall, the pre-med group's responses showed higher level of cognitive engagement with the texts than the pre-nursing students'.

In what follows, more information about the characteristics of student texts in each cognitive level and a sample of student texts for each level are presented.

Level 1: Narrating. According to the descriptor for this category, in this type of response the reader-writer narrates, records, reports, describes, or retells the reading texts without any interpretation or analysis. The reader-writer might not even have a complete understanding of what she/he has read as there is no evidence of the writer's interpretational efforts. The table below presents an example of an original text on studying abroad and the student script, a retelling of the content of the reading text (in relation to the use of underlining in this text and subsequent similar cases, see Table 3.7, item 5.d).

Table 4.8

Sample of an Original Reading Text and a Student Response Showing Level 1 of Cognition

Original reading text	Student script
Advantages and Disadvantages of Studying Abroad When people's standard of living increase, they often think about improving their knowledge for a better life. To do that, they choose to study in developed countries where they can get progressive education. However, everything has its advantages and disadvantages, so studying abroad is not an exception. In my opinion, I think studying abroad is the best way to improve ourselves. As you know, there are obvious advantages to study abroad. Firstly, we have a chance to improve our language. I think nothing is better than to learn language with the native speakers. Because we can practice with the local people what we study at school, so it is very useful to improve our listening and speaking skills. It also offers chances to discover the new cultures, way of thinking, history, customs and lifestyles. Furthermore, we have opportunities to study the new technologies and most recent science achievements. In addition, we are equipped with the valuable and updated knowledge which may help us find jobs easily after graduating. However, studying abroad is often expensive. We have to pay not only for our school fees but also for our living cost. Therefore, finance may become the biggest problem. Consequently, it distracts our mind from studying to earning money. Last but not least, adapting to a new environment is a real challenge for every foreign student. While changing the weather can affect our health, different cultures and customs may influence our mind and make us become less confident or even a victim of discrimination. Every day may turn into a struggle for survival in a strange country. If we don't have enough physical and mental strength, we will fail to adjust ourselves in the new environment. As a result, we could neither study or gain beautiful experiences as we have expected. In conclusion, while studying abroad offers great opportunities for a better future, it also has challenges that we must try our best to overcome what happened to make our dream come true. Therefore, If you have a chance I think you should take that chance to study abroad. Source: (http://www.usingenglish.com/forum/editing-writing-topics/78039-advantages-disadvantages-studying-abroad.html)	*"In my opinion I agree with him about the advantages and disadvantage for studying abroad. When the people want a great job, they work hard to get this job by choosing to study in developed countries where they can get progressive education the advantages for studying abroad is to improve their language and to learn a new technologies that will help them too much in their jobs and to improve or develop their countries. The disadvantages are they not only have to pay for their school fees, but for their living cost and how to adapt in their new environment. Those disadvantages make them worried about how they can earning money and how can adapt or communicate with others."*(PN.58.B)

As can be seen, the writer just used the ideas in the reading source and retold them (with some paraphrasing) without adding any new idea or analysis. Therefore, this text was placed under the first level of cognitive involvement.

Level 2: Interpretative and literal judgment. Texts in this level show evidence of interpretation and some level of analysis of the content read usually by focusing on one or two elements covered in the reading text and by relying on writer's prior factual and world

(experiential) knowledge to interpret the content. The writer might have a basic evaluation of the quality of the reading text by using adjectives like important, better, good with or without a reason for her evaluation. The following table shows an original text on 'canned food' and the student response illustrating this level of cognitive involvement.

Table 4.9

Sample of an Original Reading Text and a Student Response Showing Level 2 of Cognition

Original reading text	Student script
Canned Food Do you avoid eating canned fruits and vegetables because you think they may be less nutritious than fresh fruits and vegetables? For many people the idea of eating canned fruits or vegetables is really not very appealing and they would rather buy fresh produce. But what are the difference between canned and fresh produce? Let' take a look at the two. Many people are surprised to hear that canned food can have as many nutrients as fresh. This is true because the fruits and vegetables are put into the cans shortly after being picked. Because the food is canned so quickly, the nutritional content is locked in. Food in a can will stay stable for two years. Fresh produce, on the other hand, may need to be transported. This can take up to two weeks. Fresh produce will continue to lose important nutrients until it is eaten. The sooner you can eat fresh produce, the more nutritious it will be. There are also advantages to some fruits when they are first cooked and then canned. Tomatoes, for instance, have a substance called lycopene. This is a cancer-fighting ingredient that is found in cooked tomatoes. Fresh tomatoes do not have significant amount of lycopene. It is better to eat tomato sauce from a can rather than fresh tomato sauce if you want to have lycopene in your diet. Of course, there are disadvantages to canned foods. They tend to have a higher salt and sugar content. People who need to watch their salt or sugar intake should try to find cans low in salt or sugar. Also, because the canning process requires heat, some loss of vitamin C may occur, but most essential nutrients remain stable. Finally, there is the issue of taste. For many, there is no comparison between the taste of fresh fruits and vegetables versus canned. No matter what benefits of canning, some people refuse to eat anything that isn't fresh. How about you? What do you prefer? Source: a grammar book (unknown)	*"I disagree that canned foods are better. They may replace the fresh fruits and vegetables when there is lack or for who works in places where no fresh foods can be found like mountain climbers or sailors. Always fresh thing are better because if they don't benefit you they won't harm you. Canned foods may get expired early during no-good storage under extreme temperatures, which may lead to food poisoning if it doesn't get discovered early. Moreover, fresh fruits and vegetables have better taste and more attractive look to eat."* (PM.59.B)

By reading the original text, we see that the author is in favour of canned food by mentioning the advantages of canned food. It briefly mentions some disadvantages too. However, the student text shows that in spite of the favourable information in the reading text, she takes an opposing view and puts forward reasons for her position, something that is not seen in level 1 texts. Even when she mentions a disadvantage, the side that she is supporting, she does

not use the ideas mentioned in the original text, namely having high amount of salt and sugar, and lack of vitamin C; instead, she mentions another disadvantage, that of expiration and consequent food poisoning. So, it shows that the writer is trying to see the information mentioned in the original reading text in light of her own understanding and prior knowledge. She then presents her own proposition (*Always fresh thing are <u>better</u>*) and presents reasons for it (*<u>because</u> if they don't benefit you they won't harm you*). This is not considered under level 3 cognitive involvement (*relating to oneself or others*) in spite of having the pronoun 'you'. As explained earlier, if use of 'you' is impersonal, as is the case here, it refers to one or all people and its function is for interpretational purposes (e.g., talking about general truth, Yeo & Ting, 2014). Since elements of analysing, simple reasoning, and bringing evidence from their own world knowledge are evident in this student text, it was decided to be placed under level 2 of cognitive involvement.

Level 3: Self and other involvement. This category shows a dialogic thinking or reflection (Hatton & Smith, 1995) by introducing an element of justification for the stance adopted, providing feasible alternatives and engaging in critical evaluation. The writer usually tries to relate the ideas of the text to oneself or/and others (specific individuals or groups of people). It shows what the information read means to the reader and those important to her. This type of response may be seen more in responses to content of texts of a more social nature; however, even some scientific and health-related topics can illicit such responses. The following response to an original reading text about the effect of weather on people's mood is illustrative of this level of cognitive engagement:

Table 4.10

Sample of an Original Reading Text and a Student Response Showing Level 3 of Cognition

Original reading text	Student script
How the Weather Affects Our Mood Researchers in Germany sought to find out whether day-to-day weather affects people's moods. Researchers branched out beyond just sunny and cloudy and looked at temperature, wind, sunlight, rain and snow, air pressure, and how long the days were. The study was led by Jaap Denissen of Humboldt University in Berlin. The study had 1,233 participants, all living in Germany at the time. Most of the participants were women, the average age was 28, with ages spanning from 13 to 68 years old. Study participants were first given a personality test that measured extraversion, neuroticism, how open one is to experiences, and how agreeable and conscientious they are. Then, participants were given a daily online diary and asked	"*Until now researchers are not sure about how weather affects on people , and what it depends on but I think weather affecting depends on individuals how everyone sees the weather and what it means for him/her. This research was in Germany not around the world, so it has limited information because people in Germany may share some characteristics. Some people get down in rainy days*

to respond to a questionnaire that measured tiredness and positive and negative mood. Examples of positive mood included feeling "active," "alert," "attentive," "excited." Examples of negative mood included feeling "irritable," "scared," "upset," "guilty." Tiredness was measured by terms such as "sluggish," "sleepy," and "drowsy." Most of the participants began the study in the fall. Researchers looked at how much the participants socialized and slept, getting feedback on those conditions, which can affect mood. They also collected daily weather data and matched it to the participants' ZIP codes. Weather and Mood Contradicting conventional wisdom, researchers found that daily temperature, wind, sunlight, precipitation, air pressure, and how long the days were had no significant effect on positive mood. Temperature, wind, and sunlight were found to have an effect on negative mood. Sunlight seemed to play a role on how tired people said they were. Wind had more of a negative effect on mood in spring and summer than in fall and winter. Sunlight had a mitigating effect on whether people reported they were tired on days when it rained. People were so varied in how they responded that researchers write that a mood-weather link may still exist for individuals. When days become shorter, some people's moods mirrored that, while others actually felt more positive feelings. The authors speculate that those who begin to get darker moods as the days get shorter may be people at higher risk for seasonal affective disorder SAD. The authors do reveal some limitations. The participants were not asked how long they spent outdoors. But they do add that the results "can be used as a starting point for future research." Source: (http://www.webmd.com/balance/news/20081016/how-the-weather-affects-our-moods)	*because rain is continuous in their country or because rain affects on their activity, so they can't do their daily work outdoor or they didn't get enough sunlight. For some reasons rains prevent them but in our country almost everybody loves the rain because is something rarely to happen, so when it happens everybody like to see the clouds and the rain, and people in my country usually are in hot weather but I think that doesn't affects on people's mood because everywhere they sit has AC on it. Cares, homes, malls and schools. So they don't be affected by the weather."* (PN.60.D)

As can be seen, the writer is not retelling (level 1) or just interpreting (level 2) the reading text, but is arguing for her position. She evaluates the research as having a "*limited information*" and puts forward an explanation from her own world knowledge for why the participants in that research felt the way they did (none of which is mentioned in the original reading text). She then goes further and presents her own argument to show that that research was not comprehensive by relating the subject to her own country, Saudi Arabia, and how people there think about it. So it was decided to be placed under level 3.

Level 4: Prescriptive judgment. Unlike the other categories mentioned so far, in this category the reader-writer shows critical thinking by trying to put the reading content in a bigger picture and relating it to either an underlying or possibly, a connected social, political, economic or ethical issue and goes on to advocate for an action. The student response to the original text below illustrates this type of response:

Table 4.11

Sample of an Original Reading Text and a Student Response Showing Level 4 of Cognition

Original reading text	Student script
Health Effects of Seafood Seafood is a natural part of a balanced diet. It contains high levels of several important nutrients (and thus helps us maintain a good nutritional status, important for our health. The importance of diet Obesity and other lifestyle-related diseases are increasing in the western world. The World Health Organisation (WHO) has estimated that 80 per cent of cardiac infarctions, 90 per cent of diabetes type 2 and 30 per cent of cancer occurrences could be prevented with better diets, regular physical activity and not smoking. In Europe, more than 70 per cent of the most important risk factors associated with non-communicable diseases are related to our diet. These diseases are closely related to excess weight gain partly due to a high intake of e.g. sugar and energy dense foods, highlighting the importance of a healthy diet. A varied and healthy diet is a prerequisite for good health. Fish and other seafood are an important part of a balanced diet and contribute to a good nutritional status. Children, young people, pregnant women in particular eat little fish. A good nutritional status is especially important for these vulnerable groups. Seafood contains high levels of many important nutrients that are not commonly found in other foods. It is an excellent source of proteins, very long-chain omega-3 fatty acids (EPA and DHA), vitamin D, selenium and iodine. Fatty fish and certain fatty seafood products have the highest level of marine omega-3 fatty acids and vitamin D in our diet. Good for your heart health We know quite a lot about the health effects of isolated nutrients present in fish, but less about the combined effects of nutrients in fish, i.e. how fish as food contribute to promote and maintain good health.. So far the documented beneficial effects of a high intake of fish are mainly related to the content of EPA and DHA, which make the veins more elastic, prevent blood clots, reduce blood pressure, stabilise heart rhythm and generally reduce the risk of a heart attack. Other health effect from seafood Epidemiological studies have shown an association between seafood consumption and a lower prevalence of depression. This indicates that consuming seafood result in lower risk of depression. Consumption of fish and other seafood is also important during pregnancy and foetal development, including foetus growth and neurobiological development. Most studies have involved pure fish oil or capsules containing various fish oils or pure EPA and DHA. By contrast, very few intervention studies have explored the health effects of a regular intake of fish and other seafood. Hence NIFES aims to study the overall health effects of seafood intake in relation to obesity, diabetes type 2 and mental health. Source: (http://www.fisheries.no/safe_healty_seafood/Nutrion-and-health/Health_effects_of_seafood/)	*"In the present almost everyone knows that eating fish is beneficial and necessary for the diet to be complete, yet many people don't eat fish. Fish is expensive; therefore, a lot of people can't afford buying fish. Others, including me, do not eat fish because they simply don't like fish. If we think for one second about all the harmful substance we throw in the sea we will realize that when those substances spread through the water, fish are the ones in contact with those substances. Fish live in that filthy water. They live in the water that we humans made filthy by our actions. We don't realize that what we throw away is what we are going to pay a lot for eating. We are eating our own garbage. All those harmful things we got rid of in the sea are what we take back from the sea. We even pay a great deal of money to get what we throw away as garbage! That's why I rather depend on pills than force myself to eat something I don't like."* (PM.60.D)

In this response, the writer goes beyond the topic of the original text, importance of eating seafood, and tries to show how seafood might not be healthy by introducing other issues, many of which are not even mentioned in the original text. While the main purpose of the original text is to show the relationship between fish consumption and diseases (primarily a medical view), the writer is trying to relate this subject to environmental issues (polluting the sea and harming the sea animals and eventually all human beings). Not only does she try to personally and collectively identify with the content (which could be considered as level 3 cognition), she also argues how ignoring the environment and lack of cleanliness as a social practice can harm human beings (seeing the problem in a broader context). She criticises people (we) for what they are doing to the sea and warns them of the consequences hoping they would change their behaviour (call for a collective action). Therefore, this was placed under the level 4 cognitive involvement.

After categorising the student responses into different cognitive levels and showing their textual characteristics, I now turn to the second part of the research question two which was about the generic structure of student texts and whether there was interplay between the levels of cognitive engagement and generic structure of the text. It was important to know in what ways the texts of one cognitive level were similar to or different from each other. Therefore, this part of the chapter is focused on the findings on genre analysis of student responses and whether it was the same or different in texts of different cognitive levels.

4.2.2 Generic structure of student responses.

As explained in the Literature Review Chapter, to be able to examine the data for the signs of any textual structure or genre, I had to refer to the literature on genre in general, to those on opinion genre and essay studies in particular, and then apply the knowledge gained to the student responses in this study.

Reader response is a task that is common in academic settings and fulfils a communicative purpose. Having the definitions and parameters of genres and especially those of opinion and essay genres, I did this text-based explanatory study and analysed the data in order to find out whether reader response has a specific structural pattern of its own, what are the moves, what are the linguistic features of the moves, and whether the moves are affected by the level of cognitive engagement of the students with the reading texts.

4.2.2.1. Reader response genre specifications. As mentioned in the Methodology Chapter, since only the texts of 60 words and more had signs of structuring, only those texts (378 texts out of overall 600 texts) were included for genre analysis. The analysis showed that from this number, 282 texts (74.6% of all included texts in the analysis) had all rhetorical moves (refer to Table 4.12 for more details). Following the genre analysis of all 378 texts, I then ordered them according to the model of cognitive levels I had devised to see whether there was a relationship between the structural patterns of texts and the cognitive levels they displayed.

But first, the analysis showed that due to the nature of this kind of texts and due to the fact that students in this study were asked to read different articles of different topics, it was not easy to find a specific structure that a more focused task would have yielded itself to. That is, if the students were given a certain number of readings by the teachers to read and respond to, like what is done in almost all studies on reader responses, the elicited responses would have probably been easier to analyse. In that case, it would be a more structured task, with control on the reading topics and on the genre of the reading texts, two important factors in any genre analysis. However, due to the open-endedness of the task in this study, finding a more detailed structural pattern of organisation that would be applicable or seen in all the texts was not possible. Nonetheless, the general organisational patterns in texts that showed evidence of a rhetorical organisation had the following three main moves: *Introduction*, A*rgument*, and *Conclusion,* the same moves seen in certain types of opinion genres (editorials, commentaries) and in the essay genres (in relation to the use of italics here and subsequent similar cases, see Table 3.7, item 3.b). The approach in this chapter is to first describe each move and its steps in general and then see how they are, at each cognitive level.

The student text below (containing 68 words) shows the rhetorical moves of this genre. The first sentence is the *Introduction Move*, sentences 2 and 3 are the *Argument Move*, and the last sentence is the *Conclusion Move*.

Ex. 4.1:

"(1)We all know, global warming becomes international problem. (2)All people around the earth know about and they fear that may cause a lot of problem, but unfortunately we do not help to prevent the causes of global warming!(3) We know how global warming causes harmful, and effects climate and health. (4) In fact, we should make our earth more safety and suitable place to live in it." (PM.23.A)

As mentioned above, all the texts of 6o words and more were included in this analysis but some of the texts lacked the *Conclusion Move*. This was seen in both short (60-70 words) and long texts (even those more than a 100 words). From the 378 texts (100%) that were included in the genre analysis, 103 texts (27.24%) belonged to the pre-nursing group and 275 texts (72.75%) to the pre-med group. As mentioned earlier, these two groups of students had different levels of English proficiency. This might be a reason that the pre-med group's texts were longer (more than 60 words) and therefore more texts of this group were included in the data. The following table (Table 4.12) shows the number of texts included in the genre analysis from each cognitive level, the total number of words in each category for these two groups of students, and the number of texts of both groups that had all three moves.

Table 4.12

Number of Texts Included in the Genre Analysis Based on Each Cognitive Level

Cognitive levels	Total number of texts with 60 words and more				No. of texts of 60 words and more (with all 3 parts of the genre)	
	Pre-nursing	*Total no. of words*	Pre-med	*Total no. of words*	Pre-nursing	Pre-med
Level 1(narrating)	28	*2,367*	28	*4,903*	13	18
Level 2 (interpretation)	40	*3,560*	116	*17, 337*	21	105
Level 3 (self and other)	30	*3,562*	116	*18,682*	19	87
Level 4 (prescriptive judgment)	5	*574*	15	*2,930*	5	14
Total	103	*10,063*	275	*43,852*	58	224
Grand Total	378				282	

As evidenced in the table above, there is a big difference between the numbers of texts of each group being included in the analysis. Also, the mean lengths of texts of these two groups are different, by the pre-med students' texts having an average number of 158.88 words compared to that of pre-nursing students' texts (96.79), which can be an indication of the pre-med group's higher language proficiency. However, the numbers of texts that had all three parts were fewer in both groups.

As mentioned above, the genre analysis showed that there were 3 moves in this genre: *Introduction*, *Argument*, and *Conclusion*. Moves 1 and 2 were seen in all 378 texts included in this analysis (frequency of 100%), while move 3 (*Conclusion*) was only seen in 282 texts (74.6%). Researchers have used terms of 'obligatory' and 'optional' to refer to moves that are seen in a genre with a certain frequency; however, they have not been consistent in what

percentage of such frequency should be considered as a threshold for labelling a move as obligatory or optional. For instance, Gecikli (2012) and Lieungnapar and Todd (2011) considered 100% frequency for a move to be obligatory, while Upton and Cohen (2009) considered the range of 90-100%, and Mohsenzadeh (2013) the frequency of 60% as the cut-off points. Salmani Nodoshan and Montazeran (2012) used 'obligatory' for the moves that occurred in every text (100%), 'conventional' for those that happened quite often (66%-99%), and 'optional' for those happening less frequently (less than 66%). A more comprehensive method was employed by Hüttner (2010). She considered the frequency of 90-100% as 'obligatory' (text is flawed without it), 50-89% as 'typical', 30-49% as 'ambiguous' (can be core or optional based on experts' input) and 1-29% as 'optional' (not a typical feature and can be acceptable or unacceptable based on the overall purpose of the genre). Using Hüttner's categorisation, I considered moves 1 and 2 with a frequency of 100% as obligatory and move 3 which occurred only in 74.6% of texts as typical. It could be said that reader response has a genre which might be similar to those of essays (Hyland, 1990) or editorials (e.g., Katajamaki & Koskela, 2006) in having three main moves, but it has differences with them too, which makes it a unique genre.

Although Move 1 (*Introduction*) was seen in all examined texts and was realised through 5 steps or 'strategies' (Bhatia, 1997), Move 2 (*Argument*) seemed to be approached differently. It has to be noted that I use the term Argument here to refer to the main body of the text, which might be in the form of reasons, definitions, descriptions, recounts, narratives or other rhetorical modes, and not necessarily in its specific meaning as presentation of claims and counterclaims. Unlike studies that have been on argumentative essays and present the steps in the argument move (e.g., Hyland, 1990; Yang, 2009), there were not any unified steps in the body of the reader responses since the reading topics the students read were different. Therefore, I decided to use the term Argument in its general meaning as prototype to cover all the different ways that students used to present their views in this move.

Due to its subjectivity and less structured nature, reader response genre in this study acted as a container to hold different discourses (narration, argumentation, exposition). Within the Argument Move, I found a variety of discourses (exposition, narration, and argumentation), which might have been related to the influence of rhetorical patterns of the original reading texts on the students' responses (Cordon, 2000; Echoff, 1984) (see Table E1 in Appendix E for an overview of moves, steps and their examples).

For a clearer presentation of the data, in the following, each move with its specifications and example is explained and discussed. Then the findings regarding the realisation of the moves and steps in texts of each cognitive level are presented.

Move 1: Introduction

To start with, it would be helpful to know the definition of introduction and then refer to studies done on student writing (essays) and some other opinion genres to analyse our data. Afful (2010) defines 'introduction' as structurally referring to the first group of sentences in the beginning of an essay whose function is to orient the readers with the body of the essay (p. 146). However, in my study, as the student responses were mostly one paragraph in length, it was not surprising to see only one sentence and not a number of sentences to serve as an introduction (e.g., Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Ruetten, 2011). Also, studies on essays show 3-5 moves in the introduction section and each researcher defines them differently. For example, Hyland (1990) found 5 moves as the Gambit (attention grabber), Informing Moves (definitions, descriptions, critiques, or 'straw-man' arguments), the Preposition, an Evaluation, and the Marker. He considers the 'Proposition' or 'Thesis' to be the mandatory move while the others are optional. Kusel (1992) found four moves of Topic Background, Claiming Centrality, Purpose or Aims, and Indicating Route in the student essays' introductions. Similarly, Henry and Roseberry (1997) found three moves of Introducing the Topic, Narrowing the Focus, and Stating the Central Idea in essays. Moreover, Afful (2010) mentions three moves of Contextualising the Issue, Engaging Closely with the Issue, and Previewing the Structure of the Essay. Yang's study (2009) also shows that the introduction has three moves of Establishing an Issue, Appealing to the Authority, and Announcing a Position.

We can see that the most basic moves in all these studies are introducing the topic with some background information, specifying some points about it, and stating the main point. As mentioned above, the introductions in this study were comprised of one sentence; therefore, not all three moves could be seen in this genre. However, the one-sentence introduction that students wrote might have belonged to any of these moves. The move of Preview of the Text or Outlining the Structure of the Text was not seen in this genre at all again probably because the responses mainly consisted of one paragraph. Hence, there was no need for mentioning the outline of the text (response).

The data analysis showed that there were five main steps or categories of opening sentences or *introduction* that students used in their responses. They were: *general statements*, *taking a side by outward agreeing or disagreeing with the author*, *taking sides by agreeing/disagreeing with the content* (message), *being philosophical*, and *showing specific connection to the content* (refer to Table 4.16 for the frequency of these steps) (in relation to the use of italics with notions hereafter, see Table 3.7, item 3.b). Like other researchers (e.g., Henry & Roseberry, 1997), I found the main purpose of the *introduction* was to present the main idea which would be further defined or explained in the paragraph. However, grammatically, the level of complexity of sentences (use of complex sentences and prepositional phrases) in the texts of the two groups (pre-nursing and pre-med) was different apparently due to their different levels of language proficiency. Therefore, whenever the variation in some linguistic aspects of the students' texts is significant, I will mention the student groups as their language proficiency might have been the contributing factor.

Below is an explanation of each type of introductory step.

1. General statements. Table 4.16 shows that many student responses (26.1%) started with a *general statement* about the topic. The sentence structure in this type of introduction consisted of mainly simple sentences introducing a proposition. Occasionally some complex sentences with the use of adjectival clauses/phrases characterised this category. A main characteristic of these statements was that they were mainly in simple present tense and did not include any attitudinal markers (e.g., obviously, certainly, should). Therefore, they had a more objective presentation of the proposition. That is, they were mainly defining or describing some characteristics of the topic (theme) (Hyland, 1990). In the book review genre, Suarez and Moreno (2006) found that making topic generalisation was a move that writers used. This is similar to what was seen in Hyland's (1990) study and referred to as 'informing' (presenting background material for topic contextualisation), in Henry and Roseberry's (1997) as 'introducing the topic (IT)' and in Afful's (2010) as 'contextualising issues to be discussed'. Hyland also mentions that in the 'informing move' usually there is a use of restricted class of illocution (e.g., definitions, descriptions). The findings about the verb tense and structure of these general statements are similar to that of Henry and Roseberry's (1997) in which they found general nouns, nouns phrases, embedding as adjective clauses, and simple present tense (used in

examples, facts, and statistics) characterised the structure of (IT) Move. The student response below has such an introductory sentence.

Ex. 4.2:

"Smoking can causes cancers and other illnesses. For example, smoking can cause for lungs, mouth, pancreas, urinary bladder, kidney, stomach, esophagus and larynx. Cigarette smoke is composed of carcinogenic substances and other toxins. People who smoke have shorter lifes than non-smokers. Although the danger of smoking, but it is very popular among people." (PN.5.E)

Here, by putting smoking in the thematic position in the sentence, the writer presents a proposition (it can cause cancers and other illnesses). This is the most general sentence in the paragraph and the argument (the body) presents examples and more details about this statement. The last sentence is a conclusion that shows an unexpected result (will be discussed later in the section on *Conclusion Move*).

A thorough manual examination of this type of introductory step further showed the differences in the linguistic abilities of these two groups of students. While the pre-nursing students mainly used seven structural patterns to make these statements, the pre-med group used all those seven and two more (for sentence structures used and their frequencies in texts of different cognitive levels in texts of both groups refer to Appendix F, tables F1 & F1.1). As the table F1.1 in Appendix F shows, 27.2% of the usage of this kind of introductory step was seen in the pre-nursing group, while the pre-med group used it 72.8% of the time. Some stylistic and linguistic differences in the use of this type of introduction were seen in the texts of these two groups, such as occasional use of adverbs or prepositional phrases at the beginning of the sentences. Use of adverbs, adjectives, prepositional phrases, variety of verb tenses, passive structures, and compound and complex sentences are among those elements indicating the level of learners' language skills (Meyers, 2013; Oshima & Hogue, 2014). Differences in the use of these linguistic items in this introductory step were seen in texts of these two groups of students. Similar observation was made in the other introductory steps too. Comparing the language skills of these two groups of students by analysing their whole texts was not the aim of this study; however, examining the use of these linguistic elements in the introductory steps can be illustrative of these students' different language proficiency levels, which was shown to have played a role in their topic selection and length of their responses (refer to Section 4.1.3 in this chapter). Therefore, it will be mentioned in discussion of each introductory step for a comparison

of the language skills of these two groups. Table 4.13 shows the differences in the use of these linguistic elements in the *general statement* step.

Table 4.13

Some Differences in the Use of 'General Statement' Introductory Step in Texts of Both Groups

	Pre-nursing		Pre-med	
Linguistic items	No.		No.	
Adverbs	0		2	Nowadays
Prepositional phrases	0		1 1 1	For decades Decades ago Most commonly
Passive structure	1		4	
Verb tenses (inclusive of all finite verbs in the introductory sentence)	27 1 3	Simple present Simple past Present perfect	67 6 3 1	Simple present Simple past Present perfect Present progressive

It is evident that the pre-med group used more verb tenses and passive structures than the pre-nursing group. Also, some of them used adverbs or prepositional phrases at the beginning of their sentences, a trait that was not seen in any of pre-nursing group's work. This relates to writing style (Oshima & Hogue, 2007) and giving variety to the sentences which apparently the pre-med group by virtue of having a relatively more proficient command of English language writing skills seemed to make a genuine and concerted effort to employ those skills in their writing.

2. Taking a side (agreeing or disagreeing with the author). In this type of introductory step, the students started the response by announcing their agreement or disagreement with the author. According to Hyland (2005), use of verbs such as agree, disagree, and like show the 'affect' part of a writers' identity since it signals their attitude towards an issue (Hyland, 2001). Also, to be able to take a position on an issue, one has to carry out some evaluation. Indeed, Hyland and Tse (2009) define evaluation as the expression of a writer's attitudes, opinions and values (p.703). Hunston and Thompson (1999, as cited in Hyland & Tse, 2009, p. 703) also define evaluation as "the expression of the speaker or writer's attitude or stance towards, viewpoint on, or feelings about the entities or propositions that he or she is talking about." Related to this is the finding of Katajamki and Koskela (2006) which shows that introductions state or have a critical view of a subject usually in line with the writer's stance towards an issue.

The agreement or disagreement of students in this study was mainly regarding two specific areas: a) the content of the reading passage or b) the author's writing style or the organisation of the reading text. The students used different sentence structures and various phrases or clauses to show their position regarding the reading texts. Use of I agree/I disagree/I am against were among the common expressions used by the students (43/58= 74%). Studies on book reviews (Cacchiani, 2007; Motta-Roth, 1998; Salmani Nodoshan & Montazeran, 2012; Suarez & Moreno, 2006) have shown that 'initial evaluations of book' is a move in the book review genre. However, there is no personal pronouns or verbs showing agree/disagreements in these studies. This might be because a book review should be more objective and relying on factual information such as credits given to a book by well-known authors or prominent figures to give it more weight than just by making a personal judgment. Also, these researchers found appraising the book in relation to the content and author's writing style to be another move of book review and book blurb genres (Cacchiani, 2007). Mugumya (2013) found this type of sentences to be typical of opinion genres such as editorials. Use of personal pronouns (I, we) showing author identity, which is also affected by their ideology and beliefs (Ivanič & Camps, 2001), and use of verbs showing mental activities, opinions and beliefs (know, think, see, suppose, agree) are higher in this genre (Mugumya, 2013), things that we see in this study too. In essay studies, Yang (2009) found that 'announcing a position' move was seen in 96% of the introductions of essays she examined. In Hyland's (1990) study, he found that the 'proposition' is the central move and obligatory. It defines the topic and gives a focus to it and sometimes there might be an evaluation following the preposition. Also Henry and Roseberry's (1997) 'Stating the Central Idea' Move and Afful's (2010) 'Engaging Closely with the Issue' can be considered to be related to this type of introductory sentences.

This step, taking a side, has all these characteristics: taking a position, presenting the proposition, and using evaluation. A student response using this step is presented below:

Ex. 4.3:

"I agree with the author in what he said and I believe in the Importance of these programs [exercising] and how does It effect on our life." (PM.57.C)

In this response, instead of making a general statement about exercising or exercise programs, the student starts her response by announcing her agreement with the author's idea and again emphasises it by saying 'I believe' to show her strong support for the author's idea.

She also uses the noun importance to show that she evaluates these programs as important. The next example shows the student's agreement with the way the author organised the text (author's style):

Ex. 4.4:

"First, I liked the flow that the writer make in the paragraph." (PN.23.C)

In this response, the student starts her sentence by showing her agreement with the way the author used to make the ideas in the reading text flow. Students used different sentence structures in this type of introductory step (see tables F2 and F2.1 in Appendix F for the sentence structures used (and examples) and their frequencies in texts of each cognitive level in both student groups). There were nine main sentence structures or patterns that students used in this type of introduction. Overall, the pre-med group used a greater variety of sentence structures. The most used structure (20.6%) was the use of complex sentences containing a subordinator or an embedded clause which was mostly used by the pre-med group (91.7%). In addition, in the pre-med group, when they did not use outward announcement of agreement (i.e. I agree), they used other structures to show their agreement or disagreement, which further show their higher level of language proficiency. The following is an example of such:

Ex. 4.5:

"This is absolutely true because our bodies are programmed to respond to the light as morning which means work, chores, sport and another activity." (PM. 21.E)

There were overall 17 instances of disagreements (29.3%) and from this 7 belonged to the nursing group (12%) and 10 to the pre-med group (17.2%). This might be due to the bigger sample size of pre-med group in this data. It needs to be mentioned that while both groups of students showed their agreement or disagreement with the authors' ideas, for the author's writing style and organisation of the reading text, there was only one such case in the pre-nursing group but seven in the pre-med group. This indicates the pre-med students' attention not only to the content being read but also to the way it is presented.

By looking at the samples of pre-med and pre-nursing groups' introductions in this category, we can see that the pre-med group compared to the pre-nursing used a greater variety of complex structures, with some prepositional phrases at the beginning such as in this essay, in response to the article, responding to the previous article (9 cases vs. 5), use of different verb tenses (4 types vs. 3), and passive structures (4 cases vs. 0), which demonstrates the higher level

of language proficiency of this group. An observation was an increased use of past tense verbs. The use of this tense was mostly for referring to the author and usually in conjunction with a present tense verb. The following example is a good illustration of this:

Ex. 4.6:

"I agree with the author when he said 'time is said to be eternal' because it is true and time is endless." (PN.59.E)

Here, the student announces her agreement at the beginning (present tense verb) and uses the past tense to refer to the writer's ideas and then brings reasons for her agreement through the use of "*because*" and a simple present tense.

3. Taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content). Although this category is related to category 2 above, the main difference is that the focus of the introductory sentence here is not on the author, by mentioning him/her, but on the content or message of the reading text. It is also different from the introductory sentence of *general statement* as in those sentences there is no use of expressions of agreement or opinion, and also structurally most sentences used in the *general statement* introduction are simple sentences.

In this type of introductory step, use of phrases such as I agree, in my opinion, I think and I believe is common (see Table 4.14 below). Hyland (2005) considers use of such verbs (think, believe) to show the author's stance and as an 'evidentiality' aspect of writer identity (Hyland, 2005).

Table 4.14

Use of Opinion Words in the 'Taking a Side: Supporting/Rejecting the Content' Introductory Step

	Pre-nurse	Pre-med
Opinion words	No.	No.
I think	5	9
I believe	1	4
I agree	0	1
In my opinion	8	7
From/in my [personal] point of view	0	6
Total	14	27

As can be seen, from a grand total of 150 introductory sentences (40 pre-nursing, 110 pre-med) using this kind of step, only 9.3% of pre-nursing group's sentences had these items, while the pre-med group used them more (18%). Also the pre-med group had more variety of

these items at their disposal (5 types) than the pre-nursing group (3 types). However, if we consider the use of these linguistic elements in each student group, we see that from a total of 40 pre-nursing group's sentences, more than a third of them (35%) used these items at the beginning of their sentences while in the pre-med group, about a fourth (24.5%) did. This might indicate that the pre-nursing students found use of these items more indicative of showing their opinions than the pre-med group did. The students used these opinion words to signal their agreement with the message of the reading text as most often, what they wrote thereafter, was a reiteration of the message of the reading text or their understanding of the content, as the example below shows:

Ex. 4.7:

"I think that what wrote in this website is real because fast food is widespread this time."(PN.59.C)

In some other sentences where there was no use of these opinion words, the students used other structures such as the use of subordinations with conjunctions and relative pronouns to stress their position covertly. The following student's excerpt shows this:

Ex. 4.8:

"Final exams are like a nightmare to the students because the majority of student don't know the best way to study." (PN.8.C)

Kies (1990) in analysing hypotaxis relations (sentences with subordinate and relative clauses) argues that some elements of a sentence act as 'background' and some as 'foreground'. He uses these concepts to describe the relationship between 'theme' and 'focus' in the sentence, and explains that 'theme' is the 'given' information (e.g., the main independent clause), is more frequent and familiar to us and thus acts as the 'background', while 'focus' becomes the focal element and expresses new and unpredictable information. Since 'focus' is less frequent and new, it becomes more salient and acts as 'foreground'. Hyland (2005) also emphasises that although writers can show their opinion overtly by the use of words such as 'unfortunately' or 'possibly', they can also use other less obvious ways such as by using conjunctions and subordination to show their perspectives. So we can conclude that in this study, the use of these kinds of constructs functioned to direct the focus to the information presented. Therefore, students' use of subordination and relative clauses showed their support of the message of the reading text. In addition to the use of these constructs, they also used different types of words

such as attitudinal markers (e.g., should, need to), boosters (e.g., obviously) and intensifiers (e.g., so, very) in this type of introduction, which further indicate that the writer is in favour of the proposition and is not just objectively presenting the information (as seen in *general statement* introductions).

This kind of introduction can be said to be similar to the notion of 'Central Idea' move in Henry and Roseberry's studies (1997). They consider this move in the introduction of essays to have 2 purposes: stating the central idea of the essay and showing how committed the writer is to the truth of the statement. They found use of examples, categories, specific activities, trend/fashion, and alternatives to be signs of specification of CI. Also, the logical relationship of cause-effect and compare-contrast comprised most of the statements (hypotaxis relations). It can also correspond to move 2 of Afful's (2010), Engaging Closely. This move shows closer and narrower focus on the issue.

The analysis also showed that as in previous instances, the pre-med students used more structural patterns to compose this form of an introduction than the pre-nursing group (10 types vs. 7) (see Tables F3 and F3.1 in Appendix F for patterns, their frequencies and their examples). This again shows the linguistic proficiency of the pre-med group in using a variety of constructs in this kind of introductory sentences. However, it should be remembered that the total number of pre-med group's texts using this kind of introductory step almost tripled (110) that of pre-nursing's (40 texts), so this may have contributed to the lesser usage of this pattern in the pre-nursing group's texts.

As is the case in other types of introductions, we see the pre-med group compared to the pre-nursing group used more prepositional phrases at the beginning of the sentence (e.g., in general, in this article, according to the article, obviously, from my own perspective, in my opinion) (25 cases vs. 10), more variety of verb tenses (7 tenses vs.5) and passive structures (7 cases vs. 2).

Another category of introductory step is *being philosophical* which will be discussed next.

4. Being philosophical. This type of introductory sentences was usually used in responses to literary works. Students used it to show their understanding of the moral or the lesson of a story, or the contents of the reading texts which usually were on social issues and related to human behaviour. The main idea of this kind of introductory sentence was to show the students' view of life in general. This category differed from the other categories mentioned

above in that its main topic was about human being and human life, and also that more inclusive-we or impersonal 'you' referring to all human beings were used. Being the moral of the story or a reading passage, these sentences showed the students' interpretation of the reading texts. Vorenberg (2011) offers an explanation about comprehension of stories and arriving at the lesson they try to teach. She believes that the brain is wired to comprehend stories and relate to them. She explains that stories have the power to organise human actions. Characters in a story have an important role in enabling comprehension as they bring life and meaning to the story. As readers read a story, they develop the sense of empathy and sympathy towards the characters by seeing things through their eyes. That is, they can identify with the characters and as a result, comprehend the message of the story. In addition, the structure of stories has a facilitating effect on comprehension (p.260). Similarly, Zanin (2015) by analysing some researchers' work on the relationship between narrative and ethics reports that literature has an ethical aspect which not only lends itself easily to moral interpretation but also facilitates the understanding of a moral deliberation. She also presents researchers' arguments that the narratives are a source of learning morality and through their configuration, narratives deal with ethics and "presuppose the ethical question of 'how to live' [emphasis in original] (p.3).

If we consider Vorenberg's view of the stories and how our brain tries to comprehend them and draw a conclusion, we might have an explanation about the students' extracting the moral of the story/situation (in case of a response to a topic related to social issues). Both stories (fiction) and texts on social issues (non-fiction) deal with human beings and require some level of subjective interpretation, although the level of subjectivity is higher in stories as they are more imaginative and facilitate readers' expressions of feelings and emotions. Non-fiction genres, on the other hand, are relatively more objective and rely mostly on information and facts than on imagination. That explains why 72.7% of the texts having this type of introduction were responses to stories, while only 27.3% were responses to a text of social topic (non-fiction).

The text below, a response to a story, has such an introductory sentence:

Ex. 4.9:

"In life, it is very important to learn to control our anger." (PN.26.D)

This introductory sentence clearly shows the lesson that the writer learned (inferred) from the story and chose to focus on, as the main point. The writer brought the idea of "*in life*" in a

thematic position and then introduced the proposition "*it is important to learn to control our anger*". She also used the pronoun "*our*" to show the generality of the proposition.

There were mainly four structural patterns seen in these introductory sentences of both student groups (see the tables F4 and F4.1 in Appendix F). This category of introductory sentences had the least frequency in the data (only 11 cases). It was used by the pre-nursing students more (81.9%) than the pre-med (18.1%). The use of this step, as shown in Table 4.16, was not seen in texts of all cognitive levels. This issue will be discussed later in the findings of this move in texts of different cognitive levels. However, it should be mentioned that this type of category shows the readers' comprehension and interpretational level and that might be a reason why it was mostly seen in texts of level 2 of pre-nursing (54.5%) and level 3 of both groups' (45.4%).

It is interesting to see that unlike the other introductory sentences seen so far, the pre-med group did not use any adverb or prepositional phrases at the beginning of their sentences which might be due to its very small sample size in that group (only 2 cases). Also, both groups used the same type of verb tenses (simple present and simple future). This could be due to the feature of being a moral of a story. In moral one might talk about the insights or lessons learned in the form of general truth and might also focus on the result of this general truth on the person or things in the future. The example below can be helpful in illustrating this:

Ex. 4.10:

"By achieving your own goal, the happier you will be and more satisfied about yourself." (PM. 13.D)

The last category of introductory sentences is that *of making specific connection* which will follow next.

5. Making a specific connection. In this type of introductory sentences, the students connected the content of the reading text to self or specific groups of people. Producing this kind of sentences relies more on the critical-creative comprehension skills of students which shows the ability of the reader to go beyond the text and outside the literal and inferential comprehension skills to apply one's understanding by relating it to oneself or others (Che Lah & Hashim, 2014). Use of first and second person pronouns especially their subjective forms (I, we, you) is a main linguistic feature of these sentences. Studies on essay writing have shown that these pronouns are used in the introductory paragraphs; however, there is a difference between

those usages and these ones. While in the essay studies students used first person pronouns (usually singular ones) to show their presence, they mainly had what Tang and John (1999) called the 'architect' function; that is they acted as an organiser of the text (Afful, 2010; Kusel, 1992). But in this study, students used them for a different purpose. By relating the topic to themselves or to other groups of people, it seemed they wanted to show that the issue is worthy of giving attention to. Although these pronouns were used almost in all introductory steps, their rhetorical functions differed. Overall, from a total of 170 pronouns (I, we, you) used in the introductory sentences, there were 133 (78.2%) occurrences of 'I', 27 (15.8%) of 'we', and 10 (5.8%) of 'you'. The used rhetorical functions of these pronouns were: *expressing an opinion* (47.3%) in the case of 'I', and *interpretation* (62.9% & 60%) in the cases of 'we' and 'you' respectively (the rhetorical functions of the personal pronouns in student responses will be discussed in the next chapter; however, for the rhetorical functions of these pronouns in the introductory steps refer to tables G1 and G2 in Appendix G).

It needs to be mentioned that although the response starting with *making a specific connection* could continue by more elaboration on this connection and as such, making the response belong to the cognitive levels 3 or 4 (self and other involvement, prescriptive judgment), this was not seen in some cases. About 81.9% of all introductory sentences of *making specific connection* were followed by an argument move that further showed this connection, while the other arguments (18.3%) did not elaborate on this connection, relying instead on other methods of development of the ideas. In the following, we will see a student response using this introductory step and the sentences that elaborate this connection:

Ex. 4.11:

"The transition from high school to college affected my life in many different ways as any another student. After my first week, I started to feel tiredness and be sick most of my days beside losing weight noticeably. Later on, my blood analysis result shows that my immune system became deficient. I believed that those symptoms are related to my poor nutrition, which I used to have because of my busy schedule. In fact, I realized that I was under stress most of my time due to lack of time management. So, any students including myself have to manage their time to get into the new program. Unfortunately, I am not good at that until now." (PN.3.B)

In this response, after the introductory sentence which was *making specific connection* the student continued the text by mainly writing about her own experience as one member of a

group, i.e. students. That is why this whole text was categorised under the cognitive level 3. Use of first person pronouns also shows this personal connection.

A difference between the pre-nursing and pre-med group was seen in the usage of this step. While the pre-nursing students used this category and continued to elaborate on this connection, thus making their writing belong to the level 3 of cognition, the pre-med group used this category in texts of all cognitive levels except for texts of level 1. It should be mentioned that the pre-med students used this step not only to connect the topic to themselves and to other social groups but also to their culture and religion, something that was not seen in the texts of pre-nursing group.

There were seven main sentence patterns that were used to make this type of introductory sentences (Appendix F: Table F5 shows the patterns and examples of each and Table F5.1 shows the patterns and the frequency of their use in each cognitive level). Again, we see that the pre-med group compared to the pre-nursing group used a greater variety of sentence structures (7 types vs. 2). Also, we see a variety of stylistic and linguistic choices again in the pre-med group's writing, possibly due to its bigger sample size. Compared to the pre-nursing group, the pre-med group used reduced adverb clauses (e.g., *Before knowing the side effects of drinking green tea*; *As mentioned in the Quran*) at the beginning of their introductory sentence (3 cases vs. 0), prepositional phrases such as *According to the article and my experience*, *As an Arab*, *As a pre-med student*, *As a future doctor* (12 cases vs. 1), and a greater variety of verb tenses (7 types vs. 3). The total number of the use of past tense verbs in this introductory step in texts of both student groups rose to its highest (26.4%) compared to its usages in other introductory steps (*general statement* [6.9%], *taking a side: agreeing/ disagreeing with the author's idea or writing style* [17.8%], *taking sides: supporting/rejecting the content* [10.3%], *being philosophical* [0%]). However, unlike its usage in the other steps to refer to the author, in this step the past tense was used to refer to an experience or opinion of the writer (autobiographical self). The agent of the action or recipient of it was the writer herself as indicated by the use of first person pronouns and the verbs usually referring to: a) the experience of the reading and its effect, b) a related personal experience, or c) the writer's thoughts. The role of the personal pronouns, including the first person pronoun, in the reader response genre will be further discussed in addressing the third question of this study. For now, these three usages of past tense verbs with accompanying student sample introductory sentences are presented in Table 4.15 (in relation to the use of

underlining and double underlining in student texts in tables henceforth, see Table 3.7, items 5.c and 6).

Table 4.15

Use of Past Tense Verbs in the Introductory Step of 'Making a Specific Connection'

Purpose for the usage of past tense verbs	Example of student script
a. To describe the experience of reading the text and its effect	*"This is the first work I read by Kafka. For that reason I can fairly say that it took me some time to absorb and relate this kind of surrealistic stories which I am not used to reading."* (PM.37.B)
b. To refer to a related actual personal experience	*"As a personal experience, I have been under stress last year and I started to feel dizzy all the time without knowing what is wrong with me."* (PM. 13.E)
c. To mention some personal thoughts or opinions	*"I think that Arabs were also responsible for many social changes."* (PM.52.A)

After explaining all the categories of the steps in the *Introduction Move* and providing examples of each, I will now present the findings of this move in texts of different cognitive levels.

Use of Move 1 in texts of different levels of cognition. Although most of the introductory 'steps' or to use Bhatia's term 'strategies' were used in texts of both groups, the frequency of their uses varied. This frequency was based on the total number of use of each step compared to the total number of uses of all steps in each level. For example, in the pre-nursing group, in level 1 cognition, from the total of 28 texts (100%), which had the three types of steps only, the frequency of *general statement* step (66.6%) outnumbered those of the other two steps (see Table 4.16). Moreover, some categories of steps were seen in texts of all levels of cognitive engagement, while some were not.

The data of both groups' uses of the introductory techniques shown in Table 4.16 presents two kinds of figures: a) the frequency of introductory categories and their percentages (in the adjacent column) across all cognitive levels (the total of which is shown in the farthest right column of the table), and b) the frequency and percentage of categories (shown in brackets under the frequency) in each cognitive level (the total of which is shown in the last row).

Table 4.16

Use of Different Introductory Steps in Texts of Both Groups

Cog. level→ Categories↓	Level 1	%	Level 2	%	Level 3	%	Level 4	%	Total
General statement	28 *(50%)*	29.9 %	50 (31.8%)	50.5 %	17 (*11.7%)*	17.1 %	3 *(15%)*	3%	99=100% 26.1%
Taking sides (agree/disagreeing)	10 *(17.2%)*	17.2 %	25 (15.9%)	43.1 %	19 (*13.1%)*	32.7 %	4 *(20%)*	6.8 %	58=100% 15.3%
Taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)	19 *(32.7%)*	11.3 %	65 (41.4%)	43.3 %	57 (*39.3%)*	38.6 %	12 *(60%)*	6.6 %	150=100% 39.6%
Being philosophical	0	0%	6 (3.8%)	54.5 %	5 (*3.4%)*	45.4 %	0 *(0%)*	0%	11=100% 2.9%
Making a specific connection	0	0%	11 (7%)	18.3 %	47 (*32.4%)*	76.6 %	2 *(10%)*	5%	60=100% 15.8%
Total	57 (100%)		157 (100%)		145 (100%)		20 (100%)		378=100% 100%

Overall, the step most used for *Introduction Move* was *taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)* in 150 texts out of 378 (39.6%). Being an opinion genre, having the writer's agreement or disagreement with the content of the reading text was expected. Next was the *general statement* step (26.1%), which was mostly seen in texts of levels 1 and 2, underscoring the neutral and general nature of this kind of introduction. Apparently students felt safe to opt for this kind of introduction to keep within the objective mode of presenting information rather than venturing in showing their presence in the introductory sentence. *Making a specific connection* (15.8%) was the third type of introductory step used and had the highest frequency in levels 4, 2 and 3 respectively. It seems that students tried to mention themselves or others as examples of people affected or being addressed by the reading text. Surprisingly, *taking sides (Agreeing/disagreeing with the author)* step was used in 15.3% of the cases. Being an opinion genre, one would expect the students to start their response by showing their agreement or disagreement from the onset, but this was not the case probably because they did not want to focus on the writer or his style by overtly signalling their agreement or disagreement. *Being philosophical* was the least used step (2.9%) probably because the topic of *Literature* did not have a high frequency or students used other introductory steps (e.g., making a connection) in responding to literary texts.

Having these findings, in what follows I will discuss these results according to each cognitive level.

Move 1 in texts of level 1 cognition. The most used introductory step in texts of level 1 was *general statement* category (29/58=50%). *Taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)* had a frequency of 32.7% and *taking sides (agreeing/disagreeing)* 17.2%. There was no use of *being philosophical* or *making a specific connection* categories in this level. The explanation for such varied frequencies and use of a relatively limited number of steps (3 out of 5) might be due to the fact that in this level the texts show characteristics of narrating and reporting, so use of *general statements* was a more objective feature, meaning there was less obvious personal involvement of the writer. This kind of step was handy because the student could start the introductory sentence by a defining or describing statement which could easily be drawn from the reading text. The introductory steps of *taking a side* (*agreeing/disagreeing*) and *taking sides* (*supporting/rejecting the content*) comprised the rest of the usage of the steps (50%). It seems that these two steps, mainly expressing the writer's agreement with the author's ideas or style, or the message of the reading text in the texts of this cognitive level, with no attempt from the writers to add any ideas to their own responses (just retelling the authors' ideas), were easily accessible to be utilised. Use of *being philosophical* and *making a specific connection*, on the other hand, require some higher level of cognition (interpretation and application). That might explain why these two types of steps were not seen in the texts of level 1 cognition in either of the two groups' texts.

Move 1 in texts of level 2 cognition. In the texts of level 2 cognition, the use of steps of *taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)* (41.4%) and *general statement* (31.8%) had the highest frequencies. The other three introductory steps were used in the remaining texts (27%). Surprisingly, the step *being philosophical* had the lowest frequency (3.8%) among all the steps. Since this level of cognition is when the texts show signs of interpretation and use of writer's world and prior knowledge in interpreting the reading texts, it was expected to see this step (*being philosophical*) more frequently because to draw a conclusion or a moral of a reading text, one needs to understand the reading text first. The low usage of this step might be explained by knowing that the students used this type of step mostly in response to literary works (72.7%) and only three times for non-literary texts (27.2%).

However, it does not mean that students did not show interpretations in their responses. As said earlier, reading a story facilitates interpretation because of the features a story has (Vorenberg, 2011; Zanin, 2015). But for non-fiction (non-literary) texts also students need to do

analysis in order to understand them. While a story is mainly concerned with ideas and feelings requiring emotional involvement of the reader, a non-fiction text's purpose is mainly to convey some information; therefore, the readers will be looking for proof of what the writer is trying to present. Consequently, these texts need to have elements of reasoning and persuasiveness to convince the readers. Readers in turn, read a non-literary work to discover the meaning underlying the structures. That probably explains why we see that students used the steps of *taking a side (supporting/rejecting the content)* and *general statements* the most (a total of 73.2%) as a strategy to introduce the topic in general terms or to focus on a main feature at the start of their response and continue it with an argument whether by supporting it from the text or from their own world or prior knowledge.

Move 1 in texts of level 3 cognition. In texts of level 3, the introductory steps of *taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)* (40%) and *making a specific connection* (31.7%) were used the most. *Taking a side (agreeing/disagreeing)* (13.1%), *general statement* (11.7%), and *being philosophical* (3.4%) followed respectively. Again, *taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)* was used most because of it being focused on the message, as a point of departure for the students to support it by connecting it to self or others. As for *making a specific connection*, it was expected to see a high frequency of this step in texts of this level. In fact, the usage of this step across all cognitive levels was the highest in texts of this level (76.6%) compared to its use in texts of other cognitive levels (18.3% in level 2, 5% in level 4 and no usage in level 1). In texts of level 3, students started their texts by using this step and then continued it by the next move (Argument) elaborating more on this specific connection, while in level 2 texts the following argument was not on this connection but the students used other methods to elaborate on the subject, such as presenting reasons and classifying. Another point to mention is that use of *making a specific connection* was not always about connecting the topic to a human being (self or others) but also to the culture or religion of the students too. In fact, while the pre-nursing students related the topic to themselves in form of personal experiences and to others as individuals, the pre-med group used the authors' ideas to relate to a broader concept of individuals as social entities with specific culture, religion and identities. The step *being philosophical* was the least used introductory step in texts of this level (3.4%).

Move 1 in texts of level 4 cognition. In the highest level of cognition, level 4, we see that half of the texts started by *taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)*. *Taking a side (agreeing/disagreeing)* (20%) was next and both *general statement* and *making a specific connection* had the same frequencies (15%). Due to the features of texts in this level, it was not surprising to see a response starting with *taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)* focusing on the message on hand and relating it to other bigger issues. *Being philosophical* was not used in the texts of this level at all probably because in *being philosophical* the writer gives statements as morals of stories and in light of the interpretation, why something had happened and what we could learn from it. This way, it is more introspective and not prospective, which is the focus of level 4 cognition, talking about what should be done.

In the next section, Move 2, the Argument Move, is discussed and we will see what general patterns of paragraph development students used after certain introductory categories.

Move 2: Argument

As mentioned earlier, students' responses mainly consisted of one paragraph with varying lengths. This means if we exclude the introductory and closing sentences, the remaining body of the text was not expanded enough to accommodate elaborate arguments. As Hyland (1990) states elaborations of ideas and arguments are common expectations and practices in expository essays. They are also common in some types of opinion genres such as editorials. Also, unlike all other genres that follow certain chain of moves or steps in their main body (e.g., most expository essays), this study was on students' topics of interest which resulted in responses to different text types which in turn affected the students' text format too. In fact, many studies (e.g., Corden, 2000; Echoff, 1984; Tabatabaei & Amin, 2012) have shown that the structures of reading texts affect student writing and become a part of their 'formal schema' to which they can refer to in the writing of their texts.

Therefore, it is not surprising to see the texts in the Argument Move have a structure of a narration, instruction, discussion or other rhetorical modes. Bhatia (1997) believes different genres can be identified in forms of primary discourses (i.e. argumentation, description, narration, persuasion) which are used in different combination to give shape to new genres. This was seen in Cacchiani's (2007) study on book review genres. He used Werlich's (1983, as cited in Cacchiani, 2007) assertion which points out that there are five abstract text types that can be used in different genres: description, instruction, exposition, narration, and argumentation.

Moreover, Coffin (2004, as cited in Gardner & Nesi, 2013) showed how different genres are related and can be built on each other to create another genre (e.g., reporting genre → explaining → arguing → exposition and discussion). Also Gardner and Nesi (2013), examining different academic genres, noticed that some genres can be embedded or reappear in other genres forming genre sets. This resonates with what McCarthy (1991, as cited in Murdoch, 2000, p. 6) argued which is "any given text may contain more than one of the common patterns either following one another, or embedded within one another." The concept of considering genres as instances of repetition and difference (Neale, 1980) and the definition of Chandler (1997) of genres further support the finding of this study because they show that the reader response genre is one of the genres that are more flexible, i.e. more open-ended in their properties with looser boundaries (Chandler,1997). The recent concept of genres as having dynamic forms and functions and that a new genre is usually a changed or a combined version of one or several old genres (Derrida, as cited in Chandler, 1997; Todorov, as cited in Swales, 1990) results in viewing texts as 'participating' in a genre or several genres at the same time (Derrida, 2000, as cited in Dawarshi & Reiff, 2010).

However, the effect of the reading genre on the student Argument Move was not the only factor affecting the format of their Argument. Students' level of cognitive engagement with the reading text was also a factor in the structuring of their responses. This is related to what Biber (1988, as cited in Nesi, 2008) called as 'dimensions of academic texts'. He identified five dimensions in the academic texts and gave examples of each. They are 'involved vs. informational' (e.g., editorials, personal interviews), 'narrative vs. non-narrative' (e.g., romance fiction, biographies), 'explicit vs. situation-dependent' (e.g., official letters, academic prose), 'persuasive' (e.g., professional letters, press reviews), and 'abstract vs. non-abstract' (e.g., official documents).

Reviewing the above mentioned points, I now examine Move 2. In Move 1, we saw that students used various introductory steps in their responses to texts. In Move 2, we will see how students' arguments were a reflection of the cognitive level they were engaged in.

Move 2 in texts of level 1 cognition. The arguments that followed the introductory steps in this level were mainly influenced by the author's ideas and imitated the rhetorical mode of the reading text. For example, if the reading text was about listing reasons, the reader's response in this cognitive level would be a reiteration of that in the Argument, without any additional ideas

outside the reading text. This is what Vähäpässi (1982, as cited in Weigle, 2002) mentioned as characteristics of tasks that are categorised as showing the lower cognitive levels because they are only reproduction of an already existing work. The original text and the reader response in the level 1 cognition in section 4.2.1 show this point. The original text is about advantages and disadvantage of studying abroad and the student response is an imitation of the same genre type and repetition of the author's ideas in her *Argument Move*.

As mentioned earlier, the *taking a side (agreeing/disagreeing)* step has two sub-types: 1) agreeing/disagreeing with the author's ideas, and 2) agreeing/disagreeing with the author's writing style or text organization skills. The second sub-type was only found in texts of level 1 writing, unlike the first sub-type which was found in all texts of other cognitive levels. The reason for it might be that the second sub-text narrates or reports what the author has done, which is a feature of texts in level 1, usually without any evaluative elements. In general, texts of this level have the least writer presence and autobiographical self in the Argument Move. The only form of writer presence is the occasional use of I agree, I think, or prepositional phrases such as in my opinion in the *Introduction Move* of the texts of this level, which have already been discussed earlier in the *Introduction Move* section.

Move 2 in texts of level 2 cognition. All five types of introductory steps were found in responses belonging to this level of cognitive involvement. Again, as was the characteristic of writing in level 2, what is seen after the introductory sentences is the writers' (students') argument using the author's ideas and linking them to some of their own ideas whether from their own prior knowledge or general experiences. This has the feature of 'medium level of cognition' by which learners demonstrate their organising/reorganising of information usually shown in forms of paraphrasing or interpretation (Vähäpässi, 1982, as cited in Weigle, 2002).

The original text on canned food and the student script given as an example of texts of level 2 cognition in section 4.2.1 is a good illustration of this feature. We can see that while the author was in favour of canned food and focused mainly on advantages of it, the student writer showed her disagreement with the author and focused on the disadvantages of canned food. Even the disadvantages that she mentioned were from her own knowledge and not from the ones mentioned in the reading text.

This is what Jacob (2002, as cited in Lareaus et al, 2006) called 'inquiry process' by which writers use their personal experiences and world knowledge to support specific details,

negate or generalise a point, take a position, predict argumentation and defend their position or refute their opponents. Use of personal experiences to support a point will be discussed in the next section (Move 2 in texts of cognitive level 3), but use of world or prior factual knowledge is present in texts of this level and for interpretational and explanation purposes.

In sum, the Argument Move of texts of this level resembles the features of the original text with some interpretational efforts from the writer's part. The writer presence is seen more in texts of this level as the writer might be referring to general knowledge or shared world experiences to explain a point or interpret it. Discussing the stories (if the response is about a literary work) and the characters are seen in texts of this level too at the end or beginning of which there is a moral to be learned (as discussed earlier in the *being philosophical* introductory step).

In the next section we will see examples of student Argument specifications related to Level 3 cognition.

Move 2 in texts of level 3 cognition. As mentioned earlier, all categories of introductory steps were used in texts of this level. For the Argument Move of the texts, as is the feature of the texts in this level, we see the students related the content of the reading text to self or others. This others could be specific groups of people whether a conceptual entity such as children, Muslims, and parents; some social groups like women, students and doctors; or some nationalities or races like Arabs, Saudis, Germans and Western. This is again in accordance with Jacob's notion of 'inquiry process' and also is aligned with how Elder and Paul (1994) define 'critical thinking' as to involve use of information, experiences, and world knowledge in a way that helps the learner to find alternatives, make inferences, pose questions, and solve problems.

The analysis of the texts in this cognitive level showed that the writers composed their arguments showing this connection to oneself or others following four patterns:

1. Front position approach: Starting the Argument by relating the topic to one's own personal experiences, wishes, characteristics or those of specific others (Muslims, Saudis, students of this university) and then continuing it with other ideas or points mentioned in the original text. The instance of connecting to oneself or others part of the Argument would start immediately after the introductory step and would usually continue to the middle of the text.
2. End position approach: Starting the Argument with the main points or ideas and then supporting it with a personal experience, wishes, characteristics or those of specific others

(Muslims, Saudis, students of this university). It would start usually in the middle of the text and continue to the end just before concluding or sometimes, included in the conclusion.

3. Whole text approach: Starting, continuing, and finishing the Argument with a personal experience or mentioning a characteristic of the writer or those of specific others (Muslims, Saudis, students of this university).

4. General shared knowledge or experience approach: Starting, continuing and finishing the Argument by mentioning some shared knowledge or experience common to all people. Use of impersonal 'you' and 'we' is seen in this approach. The difference between this approach and approach 3 is that here the focus is on general world knowledge or experience shared by all people or anyone, while in approach 3 the focus is on specific characteristics or experiences shared by specific persons or groups of people (e.g., Saudis). Table 4.17 shows the use of these approaches in texts of this level in both student groups.

Table 4.17

Frequencies of Different Approaches in the Development of the Argument Move in Texts of Level 3

	Front position	End position	Whole text position	General shared knowledge/experience	Total no of texts
Pre-nursing	1 *(3.3%)*	10 *(33.3%)*	6 *(20%)*	13 *(43.3%)*	30 *(100%)*
Pre-med	21 *(18%)*	32 *(27.5%)*	41 *(35.3%)*	22 *(18.9%)*	116 *(100%)*
Total	22 (15%)	42 (28.7%)	47 (32%)	35 (23.9%)	146 (100%)

As can be seen, the most used approach in the pre-nursing group was the general shared knowledge/experience (43.3%) and the least was the front position (3.3%). On the other hand, the pre-med group used the whole text approach more (35.3%) and the front position the least (18%). Overall, the use of whole text approach was the most used approach (32%) comprising almost one third of the whole level 3 texts and the front position was the least (15%).

In the following, examples of student texts having these approaches are presented. Underlining has been used to clearly show the type of positioning (refer to Table 3.7, item 5.b henceforward). The first example is a response to an article about spanking children. The writer used the front position approach in her response.

Table 4.18

Front Positioning Approach in the Construction of Argument Move in Texts of Level 3 Cognition

Positioning approach	Example
Front positioning	*"(1) The article has showed that all forms of physical punishment lead to negative effect and outcomes but I don't completely agree with the article. (2) I was spanked when I was child on what I do wrong after I get a first warning, and that did not affect me badly. (3) Indeed, I stopped all wrong behavior because I know it is wrong since I have spanked for doing it. (4) Actually I think it depend on parent in the way they punish their children like how often and how strong without explain to them why they were spanked. (5) Some parent may not explain to their children why do they punish and spank them, therefore children might think that they are worthless and their parent don't like them and this can lead to negative effects and outcomes. (6) However, I think that the government took a good choice with taking its position against spanking because it's safer for children from parent who don't correctly punish their children and severely spank them. (7) Additionally, alternative strategies are much better and effective in controlling children's behavior without any harm."* (PM.39.B)

In this text, the student started by using *taking a side (agreeing/disagreeing)* type of introduction and announced her disagreement with the author (sentence 1). Then she began her argument by bringing her own personal experience and trying to refute the author's idea (sentences 2-3). Then she moved to present her own opinion on the matter by suggesting what could work in this case (parents' explanation to children about their wrong-doings) (sentences 4-5). Towards the end, she returned to the idea mentioned in the original text and supported the government's action (sentence 6). In sentence 7, she concluded the sentence (but uses a wrong conclusion marker) by reiterating her position.

The next table shows a response to an article about organic food which used the end position approach.

Table 4.19

End Positioning Approach in the Construction of Argument Move in Texts of Level 3 Cognition

Positioning approach	Example
End positioning	*"(1) Organic food has been a common issue lately. (2) People are becoming more aware about organic food and many organic food stores started opening. (3) The lower cost and the wider spread of the inorganic food make it easier for people to get them. (4) I think organic food is more beneficial and tastes better even though the evidence is still unclear and it costs much more than the inorganic food. (5) For example, I have tried organic Halloumi cheese and inorganic Halloumi cheese, the*

	organic one tasted away better, and it felt more fresh and healthy. (6) What I really hope that people become more aware about organic food and that we have more organic food stores in Saudi Arabia to get it easily." (PM.56.B)

In this response, the writer started by a *general statement* introduction (sentence 1). She started the Argument by mentioning one idea of the original text (people's awareness about the benefits of organic food and comparing this kind of food with inorganic food) (sentences 2-3). She then moved to present her opinion about the subject and brought an example of her own likes and dislikes (sentences 4-5). Here, she used the end position to present her own experience. She once more emphasised her belief in the subject by bringing it in the conclusion and wishing for availability of organic food in her own country (sentence 6).

Use of whole text approach is illustrated in the following Table. It is a response to an article about the benefits of listening to music.

Table 4.20

Whole Text Approach in the Construction of Argument Move in Texts of Level 3 Cognition

Positioning approach	Example
Whole text	*"(1) In response to the article, I do agree that listening to music would have a positive effect on someone's state of mind, especially when an environment is not quiet enough, or sometimes too quiet, to complete a task. (2) For me, I have difficulty reading when there is noise around so I put my headphones on and the problem is solved. (3) However, I do prefer reading in more quiet circumstances but when I'm in a public place having my iPod with me definitely saves me going through the obnoxious experience where I spend five minutes trying to read a sentence. (4) I also enjoy listening to music in the car, makes it more enjoyable to spend an hour to reach home in the city of Riyadh. (5) Listening music while doing house chores would probably fasten the process. (6) I am not one of the believers in the " Mozart effect" theory that listening to specific kind of music make you smart although many studies do prove listening to music improve mathematical abilities, which someone already obtains. (7) All in all, it is agreeable that music does have a positive effect on people's mood and productivity, however I do think that it applies at all times and on all people."* (PM.27.E)

In this text, the writer used the *taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)* introductory sentence and then started the Argument Move by focusing on herself and her difficulties in studying in noisy places (sentences 2-3). In sentences 4 and 5, she shows her interest in listening to music in certain situations and in sentence 6 she talks about her own opinion about Mozart Effect. The last sentence is the conclusion.

The last table (Table 4.21) shows a response to an article about working parents. The student used general shared knowledge/experience approach in the development of the *Argument Move*.

Table 4.21

General Knowledge Approach in the Construction of Argument Move in Texts of Level 3 Cognition

Positioning approach	Example
General knowledge/experience	*"(1) In my opinion, this story it just to remember us to care about our family's and we shouldn't let the time slip us form them. (2) So we have to arrange our time between the working and the family. (3) "everything in the world has alternative just the family". (4) And if we die, the company that we are working for could easy to find other persons to replace us. (5) But the family and friends we leave they feel the loss of the rest of their lives."* (PN.17.E)

In this example, the student began by *making a connection* introductory step and connecting the topic to all people by using the inclusive-we (sentence 1). She then moves to another general statement about work and family and connects it to all people (sentence 2). In sentence 3, she mentions a famous saying (shared world knowledge) and in sentences 4-5 she further argues for her position by relying on shared knowledge and experience of all people. There is no conclusion for this text.

In general, texts of this cognitive level have the most writer presence either by connecting the content to all people; to oneself or one's religion, culture, race; or to specific groups of people. The Argument Move has a more distinct feature as personal experiences or statements are seen in these texts and different rhetorical approaches are taken in incorporating these into the *Argument*.

In the following, we will see the development of arguments in texts of level 4 cognition.

Move 2 in texts of level 4 cognition. In the 20 texts belonging to this level, all introductory step types were seen except for the *being philosophical*. This can be explained by knowing that this step was typically on topics related to life in general or life lessons. The writers used this technique to express realities of life and what they are. But in level 4 writing, the writer relates the topic, usually a social problem, to broader issues and usually calls for an action on how they should be handled and by whom. Sometimes this whom was explicit and named in student writings but in other times it was not. Example 3.2 on smoking problem given earlier is a good illustration of texts of this level and the agent for the action, the government, is named by

the student. She placed this call for an action at the end of her text to serve as the conclusion too. In fact, from a total of 20 (15 pre-med and 5 pre-nursing) texts of this level, 15 (11 pre-med and 4 pre-nursing) texts (75%) had the call for an action at the end of the text acting as a conclusion. It seems that texts of this cognitive level show a basic problem-solution relationship, and apparently the writers felt that having the solution at the end would make it stronger as it was their last word or thought on the topic.

After discussing the textual characteristics of Move 2 in different cognitive levels, it might be informative to know whether there was any relation between Move 1 and Move 2; that is, whether there was a pattern in the use of certain introductory steps and the types of arguments following them. The next section is a summary of the findings.

Relationships between Move 1 and Move 2, and their interaction in each cognitive level. After reviewing the types of steps in Move 1 and discussing the Arguments (Move 2) that were seen in each cognitive level, I examined the data for any patterns in occurrence of the introductory steps (Move 1) and the type of arguments (Move 2) that followed them. As not all texts included in the genre analysis had Move 3, it was not considered in this pattern-seeking analysis here.

It was mentioned earlier that Bhatia (1997) believes any of four primary discourses (Argument, Narration, Expository, Persuasion) can be found in any genre. Also Macken-Horarik (2002, as cited in Johns 2003) mentions 3 elemental genres (Discussion, Procedure, Narration) seen in many genres. Having these typologies in mind, I divided the text types of the *Arguments* into exposition, argumentation, and narration and further categorised their subdivisions, i.e. the focus of each subtype, based on their descriptions in writing textbooks (e.g., Brems & Jones, 2008; Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Ruetten, 2011) (refer to Table 4.22 below). As mentioned before, the students' responses were of varying lengths. Therefore, it needs to be remembered that these divisions and subdivisions are based on what the student texts roughly presented. They do not mean a standard full-fledged discourse type or text type but that they had some elements of exposition, narrative or argumentation (focusing for example on definition, analysing effects, evaluation etc.). So a student text labelled as argumentative, for instance, did not have all the elements of an argumentative essay, rather it showed elements of reasoning for or against a point mentioned in the reading text (without refutation). Or, when it was labelled as reporting, the text had elements of reporting such as use of reporting verbs (e.g., said) and having the author or the

article as the agent of an action (e.g., "*The article talk about everything that the reader need to know about water such as how the water is important, why it is important, water function in the body*" [PM.31.A]). I also labelled some of the student texts as summary since summary writing is a skill (Brems & Jones, 2008; Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Ruetten, 2011) and can be seen for any type of genre (e.g., a summary of a story or a summary of a scientific article on a medical procedure).

Table 4.22 shows the main divisions of the *Argument* text types and their subdivisions along with their distribution and frequencies. It could be seen that some text types were used after certain introductory steps and some were not used in them at all. For example, while argumentation (reasoning) was seen to follow all introductory steps, reporting was seen only following the *taking a side: agree/disagreeing* step.

Table 4.22

Frequency of Each Text Type Following Each Introductory Step (Both Groups)

MOVE 1 → / MOVE 2 ↓	General statement	Taking a side: A/D	Taking sides: sup. content	Philosophical	Making a connection	Total
***Expository**:*						
Definition/Description	46 (46.4%)	5 (8.6%)	22 (14.3%)	0	2 (3.3%)	75
Process	7 (7%)	0	6 (3.9%)	0	0	13
Cause	2 (2%)	1 (1.7%)	3 (1.9%)	0	0	6
Effect	19 (19.9%)	4 (6.8%)	30 (19.6%)	0	5 (8.3%)	58
Cause-effect	7 (7%)	1 (1.7%)	0	0	0	8
Reporting	0	5 (8.6%)	0	0	0	5
Compare-contrast	1 (1%)	1 (1.7%)	0	0	0	2
Subtotal	*82 (82.8%)*	*17 (29.3%)*	*61 (39.8%)*	*0*	*7 (11.6%)*	
***Persuasive**:*						
Argumentation	5 (5%)	25 (43.1%)	32 (20.9%)	3 (27.2%)	16 (26.6%)	81
Evaluating	10 (10.1%)	9 (15.5%)	26 (16.9%)	2 (18.1%)	13 (21.6%)	60
Problem-solution (opinion-based)	2 (2%)	2 (3.4%)	8 (5.2%)	0	0	12
Subtotal	*17 (17.1%)*	*36 (62%)*	*66 (43.1%)*	*5 (45.4%)*	*29 (43.8%)*	
***Narrative**:*						
Story	0	0	2 (1.3%)	1 (9%)	20 (33.3%)	23
Subtotal	*0*	*0*	*2 (1.3%)*	*1 (9%)*	*20 (33.3%)*	
Summary	0	5 (8.6%)	24 (15.6%)	5 (45.4%)	4 (6.6%)	38
Subtotal	*0*	*5 (8.6%)*	*24 (15.6%)*	*5 (45.4%)*	*4 (6.6%)*	
Total	*99*	*58*	*153*	*11*	*60*	*382*

The most used type of genre (82.8%) that followed the introductory step of g*eneral statement* was the exposition, and the most used text types (66.3%) were definition/ description (46.4%) and analysing effects (19.9%). As mentioned earlier, this type of step introduces the topic in a general way. Apparently after this step the writers felt it would be better to define or

give more explanation about the topic, or focus on the effects of it. We also see that in 10 cases an evaluation followed this type of step and that was because the writer was simply evaluating the reading passage or the writer's style. Some text types (i.e. reporting, story) did not follow this type of step at all and use of summarising was not seen after this step. Unlike the *general statement* step, the *taking a side (agreeing/disagreeing)* step seemed to be mostly followed by a persuasive type of genre (62%), and the most used text types were argumentation (43.1%) and evaluating (15.5%). This was expected since it seems logical to set out with *taking a side* and continue by justifying or reasoning for one's position. Use of expository genres still had a significant place (29.3%) in the text types that followed this type of step.

In texts starting with the *taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)* step, we see that there is a greater balance in the use of expository (39.8%) and persuasive (43.1%) genres following this step. Use of story text type is seen in these texts too. The most used text types were argumentation (20.9%) and analysing effects (19.6%). Again, we can expect to see argumentation for justifying the support or rejection of the reading content. However, the high usage of analysing effect might have been due to the genre of the reading text rather than the writer's own prior factual or world knowledge and experiences.

As for the *being philosophical* step, we do not see any expository type of genre, which was expected as this type of introduction was usually in response to a literary text. Instead, use of persuasive genre (45.4%) in forms of argumentation (27.2%) and evaluation (18.1%) was seen to follow this step. Another feature of texts following this type of introduction was the use of summarising skill (45.4%) to present the main point. This was expected as in these texts the writers started the response by focusing on the moral of the story or the lesson learned. They then could continue it by bringing more points of the reading text to remember and learn from (summary), by arguing for the point learned and bringing support from the reading text, usually a literary text, or by evaluating the text by focusing on the characters or events in the story.

Making a specific connection introductory step was usually followed by a persuasive type of genre (43.8%) mostly in form of argumentation (26.6%). This type of step seemed to flow better by arguing the writer's position or showing the relationship that the writer was trying to forge between the topic and self or specific others. Another expected finding was that use of story genre was in its highest in texts following this step (33.3%). As the writer starts by

connecting the topic to herself or specific others, it is expected to explain the association by bringing a short story which could be a personal experience, or a cultural aspect of the issue.

In general, the use of persuasive genre outnumbered those of expository and narrative in all introductory steps except for the *general statement* step, which was mostly followed by an expository genre. This can be due to the nature of reader response genre which is opinion-based and writers express their position regarding a topic and justify it.

The next table (Table 4.23) shows the data in yet another angle, specifically, seeing the association between the text types and cognitive levels.

Table 4.23

Frequency of Different Text Types in Each Cognitive Level (Both Groups)

Cognitive Levels →	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
MOVE 2↓				
Expository:				
Definition/Description	20 (33.8%)	36 (22.9%)	19 (13%)	0
Process	7 (11.8%)	4 (2.5%)	2 (1.3%)	0
Cause	3 (5%)	3 (1.9%)	0	0
Effect	9 (15.2%)	29 (18.4%)	21 (14.3%)	0
Cause-effect	4 (6.7%)	3 (1.9%)	1 (1.3%)	0
Reporting	5 (8.4%)	0	0	0
Compare-contrast	1 (1.6%)	0	1 (1.3%)	0
Subtotal	*49 (83%)*	*75 (47.7%)*	*44 (30.1%)*	*0*
Persuasive:				
Argumentation	0	21 (13.3%)	49 (33.5%)	11 (55%)
Evaluating	0	38 (24.2%)	21 (14.3%)	1 (5%)
Problem-solution	0	1 (0.6%)	2 (1.3%)	8 (40%)
Subtotal	*0*	*60 (38.2%)*	*72 (49.3%)*	*20 (100%)*
Narrative:				
Story	0	0	23 (15.7%)	0
Subtotal	*0*	*0*	*23 (15.7%)*	*0*
Summary	10 (16.9%)	22 (14%)	6 (4.1%)	0
Subtotal	*10 (16.9%)*	*22 (14%)*	*6 (4.1%)*	*0*
Grand total	59	157	146	20

As shown in the table, some of the text types seemed to be used in texts of certain cognitive levels and not in others. For example, the argumentation text type was seen in all cognitive levels except for level 1, or story text type was seen only in texts of level 3.

As mentioned before, texts of level 1 (narrating) show the minimum level of writer's cognitive involvement with the reading text; therefore, it is not surprising to see most text types (83%) following the introductory steps belonged to the expository genre with the definition/description text type having the lead (33.8%). Similarly, the other kind of text

produced in this level was summary writing. As expected, there was no use of persuasive text types in texts of this cognitive level. Texts of level 2 (interpretation) had both genres of exposition (47.7%) and persuasion (38.2%) with no narrative genre. The high incidence of the use of the persuasion genre, especially that of evaluating text type (24.2%) shows that the writers had some level of engagement with the reading text by expressing their opinions or reasons for a position taken. Squire (1964, as cited in Al-Mahrooqi, 2011a) believes that use of questioning; inquiring; moral and personality judgements; and didactic comments, based on religion or culture to support one's understanding of a text and his/her judgements thereof are all part of interpretational efforts that a reader-writer might get engaged in. All of these cognitive processes have an evaluative aspect, so use of persuasive text types was an expectation to be seen in the texts of this cognitive level.

In texts of level 3 (relating to self and others), we see a decline in the use of expository genre (30.1%) but an increase in the use of persuasive genre (49.3%). Use of narrative genre is also seen in texts of this cognitive level (15.7%). These can be explained by the feature of texts of this level which show the writer's attempt in connecting the topic to self or specific others or her religion, country or culture. About one third of the texts had an argumentative text type and presented not only the reasons but also justification as well. The other two highly used text types were analysing effects (14.3%), usually bringing personal experiences to support each effect or point, and evaluating (14.3%), by showing assessment of the content, characters or the author and making a connection between them and the writer's own personal, cultural, religious, or social experiences. Squire (1964, as cited in Al Mahrooqi, 2011a) calls this self-involvement and Dreyfus and Barilla (2005) call it personal connection, in which the writer relates the reading content to her/his own life or to that of others around her/him. Not only does this necessitate comprehension and evaluation of the reading text but also connecting it to self or others.

The highest cognitive level (prescriptive judgment) is described as seeing the bigger picture and calling for action. We can see that the persuasive genre was the only text type seen in texts of this level and expectedly both argumentation and problem-solution text types had the highest rate of occurrence (55% and 40% respectively). It needs to be mentioned that while in the argumentation texts we see reasoning and justification for a position, in the problem-solution text type we see a problem, usually a social problem, is presented and some solution (advice and suggestion) is given, which further highlights the features of the texts of this cognitive level. This

is the stage which has been called 'critical reflection' (Hatton & Smith, 1995; Van Manen, 1977) and the writing of which has be described as a text that explains a situation or a topic in a more broad context (Sparks-Langer et al, 1990). To critically reflect, one not only has to consider the immediate circumstances about an issue but also see the links to it and make a prediction accordingly.

Overall, what these findings show us is that the expository text types had a higher frequency (43.9%) and were seen in texts of levels 1-3, while the persuasive text types had a lower frequency (34.5%) and were seen in texts of levels 2-4. This is consistent with Al-Mahrooqi's (2011b) findings which showed that the students' interpretational responses had more frequency than other types of responses. She attributed this to the approach that is favored and is an expected objective of the education. Students are required to write essays to show knowledge gained by the book or teacher (Henry & Roseberry, 1997, p. 479). However, in order to develop students' higher levels of thinking, students should be exposed to a variety of text types, and not solely to the expository ones. This can show them how arguments and evaluations are made and can enable them to produce texts that have evidence of higher levels of thinking. Having discussed the patterns seen between Move 1 and Move 2, I will now turn to the last move of the reader response genre, conclusion.

Move 3: Conclusion

Writing textbooks usually define conclusion as the closing part of the paragraph or essay that "gives a sense of completion on the subject" (Wyrick, 2008, p. 84), and mention three purposes for conclusions in an essay: signalling the end of the text, stressing the main points, and expressing the writer's thoughts on the topic (Oshima & Hogue, 2007, p. 153). Writing textbooks also instruct learners to use different strategies to conclude their paragraphs or essays: use of call for action, restating, recommendations (Lagan, 2013; Meyers, 2013; Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Ruetten, 2011), consequences, comments (Meyers, 2013; Oshima & Hogue, 2006), summarising (Oshima & Hogue, 2006), predictions (Berms & Jones, 2008; Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Ruetten, 2011, Wyrick, 2008), suggestions, opinions (Brems & Jones, 2008), evaluation of the importance of the subject, implications, warning, quotation, and rhetorical questions (Wyrick, 2008).

As mentioned earlier, conclusion was a typical and not an obligatory move as it occurred in only 74.6% of the texts. This is consistent with Henry and Roseberry's (1997) finding too. In 22% of their sample, conclusion move was not seen, which made them consider it as not

obligatory. Similarly, Kusel (1992) found that 12% of the student essays did not have this move. In a few other studies on the genre of essays and their conclusions (e.g., Hyland, 1990; Liu, 2015), there is no mention of this move being obligatory or optional. In the opinion genres we see that the conclusion move is seen in editorials (e.g., Katajamaki & Koskela, 2006) and comment articles (Ledema et al, 1994, as cited in Mugumya, 2013). However, the book review and book blurb genres do not have this move; instead, they have a move called 'appraising the book' which is usually at the end of these genres and apparently acts as a conclusion by evaluating the work and its worthiness (e.g., Cacchiani, 2007; Motta-Roth, 1998; Salmani Nodoshan & Montazeran, 2012; Suarez & Moreno, 2006). In fact, in their study on book reviews written by both native and non-native speakers, Salmani Nodoshan and Montazeran (2012) found that Move 4, providing closing evaluation, by the use of conclusion markers (e.g., in sum, finally) signalled reaching the end of the review and contained an overt evaluation of the book mentioning whether it is worth reading or not. They concluded that the recommendation of the reviewer acted as the closing of the text.

In this study, most conclusions consisted of only one sentence, but two-sentence conclusions could occasionally be seen. The table below illustrates this.

Table 4.24

Frequency of One or Two-sentence Conclusions

	Pre-nursing				Pre-med				
Cognitive levels→	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	*Total*
One sentence	12	20	16	5	18	98	82	12	*263*
Two sentence	1	1	3	0	0	7	5	2	*19*
No conclusion	15	19	11	0	11	10	28	2	*96*
Total	28	40	30	5	29	115	115	16	*378*

As can be seen, from a total of 378 texts included in the genre analysis, 282 texts had conclusions and from this number only 19 texts had a two-sentence conclusion (6.7%). The student excerpts below are examples of one- and two-sentence conclusions.

Ex. 4.12:

"Finally, I advise you to read this story when you try to say a horrible things to someone." (PN.40.B)

Ex. 4.13:

"All in All, I agree with saving books for seeking knowledge or rereading. However, buying

books and saving them for the impression that they might have on the person is wasting of time and money." (PM.49.C)

Surprisingly, not many concluding words or markers such as In conclusion, All in all, In sum were used, despite the students having learned them in their writing courses and using them in their classroom writing assignments (paragraphs and essays). Use of discourse markers for the conclusion part of an essay has been regarded as an optional move (Hyland, 1990). Apparently in this study students felt that it was not a necessary step to have in this type of writing. Table H1 in Appendix H shows the concluding words that were used by the students, some of which have been taught in their writing classes and writing textbooks (e.g., Oshima & Hogue, 2007), and some others have not. As shown in that table, from the total of 282 texts with a concluding sentence(s), 106 texts (37.5%) had a discourse marker signalling the *Conclusion Move*. From this number, 60.3% of the words were the markers that have been taught and from this, the five markers of finally, all in all, to sum up, in the end, and actually were used by both groups (57.8%), while the others were used only by the pre-med group. Also, the variety of markers used was different in the two groups. Overall, the pre-nursing group used only 10 different markers, while the pre-med group used 28. This might further indicate the higher linguistic ability of the pre-med group (see Appendix H for the list).

Beside the markers, it was observed that they used in my opinion (5 instances), I think (7 instances), and I hope (9 instances) to present their opinions or wishes as a conclusion of the text. This is consistent with Liu's finding (2015), which shows his Chinese EFL students used in my opinion and in my view in their essay conclusions. From the 21 sentences starting with these words, 9 (42.8%) started with "*I hope*", which at the same time indicated a wish about the situation being discussed. Sometimes (3 cases), what followed after I hope was a religious wish, showing the interplay of culture and writing and the fact that the writers' identity is influenced by the values that govern their society or discourse community and can be utilised for their interpretation of their personal, social, and cultural experiences (e.g., Hyland, 2002; Ivanič & Camps, 2001).

Before discussing the different types of conclusion seen in this study, it would be helpful to review the findings of studies on opinion and essay genres regarding this move. Katajamaki and Koskela (2006) found a concluding move in the editorials which they called 'Coda'. They explained that the Coda had two steps: conclusion and moral. Similarly, Ledema et al (1994, as

cited in Muguma, 2013) found the move Conclusion in the genre of comment articles. The conclusion move was usually in form of a restatement of the thesis. In the essay studies, researchers have used different terms to refer to the steps in the conclusion. For example, Hyland (1990) found 4 steps in this move: Discourse Marker (signalling the ending), Consolidation (presenting significance of the argument to the preposition), Affirmation (restating the preposition), and Close (widening context or prospective of preposition). Hyland asserts that the Discourse Marker is an optional step and has a limited lexis to realise it. Consolidation is obligatory; it refers to the content of the argument and relates the theme or the proposition being made. The Affirmation restates the proposition (thesis) and is similar to the introduction (optional and flexible in place whether before or after Consolidation). Close unlike the other moves is prospective and looks forward to aspects of the discussion that have not been overtly discussed by expanding the context, giving a comment on the problem or situation, and motivating readers to think. Liu (2015), adopting Hyland's (1990) model on essay genre moves for examining her Chinese EFL students' essay conclusions, found all four moves but with different degrees of frequencies. She also found three types of Close: appealing, solution, prediction or expectation.

Similarly, Henry and Roseberry (1997) found 3 steps in the conclusion move: Commitment to the Central Idea (CC), and Expansion (EX) which connects the main idea to a wider context, with CC usually preceding EX. The steps in the CC were mostly in the form of evaluation and restating or affirming the Central Idea. Other strategies were used infrequently, such as stating personal opinion or reacting to CI, making a prediction, stating a solution, showing the consequences, summing up and evaluation, and admonishing (warning). The Expansion (EX) step was usually in form of evaluation, identifying greater problems, a personal response, giving consequence of the problem, offering an alternative or making a suggestion, prediction, and showing future directions. Kusel's (1992) study on undergraduate student essays showed that the conclusion move had 4 steps: Review of the Ground Covered (indication of route), Internal Outcomes or Results (summary of what the essay did/or new conclusion to be drawn), External Outcomes (implications) and Reservations Placed on Outcomes (limitations of the outcomes). In a more detailed analysis of student essays, Hüttner (2010) found students used Summary statement or review, Qualifying and evaluating the paper/result, Providing a personal reflection, Providing a wider outlook, Presenting new information, Appealing to reader, and

Acknowledging gratitude respectively (refer to Appendix I, Table I1 for an overview of these studies).

In spite of different terminologies, the studies above show certain steps are seen in essay closing. Henry and Roseberry's Commitment to the Central Idea corresponds to Kusel's Internal Outcomes and includes Hyland's Marker, Consolidation, and Affirmation steps. The Expansion step in Henry and Roseberry's study which connects the main idea to a wider context corresponds to Kusel's External Outcomes and Hyland's Close steps. Its function is to evaluate and predict. To sum up, a careful review of these studies shows that we can categorise the conclusion move and steps into two broad groups: those that are based on the writer's ideas discussed in the body of the text, such as summarising (Hyland, 1990, Kusel, 1992) and those that are from outside of the writing text such as future direction (Henry & Roseberry (1997) and providing wider outlook (Hüttner, 2010). Also, it needs to be pointed out that some of the steps mentioned by these studies are very general and do not specify its content. For instance, Hüttner's (2010) step of 'providing wider outlook' does not specify in what form this is presented, whether as an opinion, a prediction, or a warning.

The analysis of the *Conclusion Move* in the present study showed different types of steps that students used to realise this move. Based on the review of the literature on this move, I decided to divide the students' conclusions into two broad categories: *text-driven* and *writer-driven*. The *text-driven* conclusions are those based on the ideas of the author in the text but reformulated as a *restatement* or a *summary (*e.g., Hyland; 1990; Ledema et al, 1994, as cited in Muguma, 2013; Liu, 2014). They are objective conclusions. The *writer-driven* type of conclusions, on the other hand, are subjective which show the writer's (here reader's) opinion about or reactions towards the reading topic in forms of *wishing* (called 'expectation' by Liu, 2015), *opinion* (or 'personal opinion' by Henry & Roseberry, 1997), *advising* (termed 'offering alternatives' by Henry & Roseberry, 1997), *rhetoric* (referred as 'appealing to the reader' by Hüttner, 2010, Liu, 2015), *evaluating* (used by Henry & Roseberry, 1997; Hüttner, 2010), *result* (called 'consequence' by Henry & Roseberry, 1997 and 'implications' by Kusel, 1992), *unexpected result* (called as 'new information' by Kusel, 1992; Hüttner, 2010), *prediction* (Liu, 2015; Henry & Raseberry, 1997), and *warning* (called 'admonishing' by Henry & Roseberry, 1997) (in relation to the use of italics with the notions henceforth, refer to Table 3.7, item 3.b).

All these eleven types of concluding sentences were used in student writings with different frequencies.

The following discusses the above-mentioned 11 types of concluding steps seen in this study.

A. Text-driven conclusions. These conclusions were based on the author's ideas presented in the text but the students tried to paraphrase or summarise the main idea(s) (Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Ruetten, 2011; Wyrick, 2008). They were therefore objective. They included *summarising* and *restating* (also called 'commitment to the central idea' by Henry & Roseberry, 1997; 'internal outcomes' and 'ground covered' by Kusel, 1992; and 'consolidation and affirmation' by Hyland, 1990).

1. Summarising. In this step, the writer summarised the main points mentioned in the *Argument Move*. It has been termed as 'ground covered' by Kusel (1992) and 'summary' or 'summing up' by others (e.g., Henry & Roseberry, 1997; Hüttner, 2010). As expected, use of conjunction 'and' was seen in 13 conclusions of this type (86.6%) to connect the ideas or points whether as nouns (38.4%), verbs (26.6%) or clauses (23%). Also, it seems the use of discourse markers (in short, to sum up, to conclude, indeed, overall) was high (from a total of 106 markers used in all conclusions, 9 cases (8.5%) were seen in this type). Below is an example of this kind of conclusion:

Ex. 4.14:

"In short, media has a huge influence on students' lives and they need to take advantages of that and use it wisely." (PM.41.B)

2. Restating. This type of step included the writer's reiteration of the point mentioned in the introductory step. Ledema et al (1994, as cited in Muguma, 2013) call it 'restatement' and Hyland (1990) 'Affirmation' or a restatement of the preposition. Although this type of conclusion requires less cognitive effort, as the idea is already present in the Introductory Move, it was not used as much as expected (15 cases=5.3%). This might be due to students' lack of paraphrasing skills. The following shows an example of such conclusion (the introductory sentence is given for a comparison and the repeated or rephrased parts are underlined).

Ex. 4.15:

Introduction: *"The emotional bond between the mother and her baby is very unique."* (PM.28.D)

Conclusion: *"In short, the bond between mothers and their children are strong and mysterious that no one can take this role in anyway."* (PM.28.D)

B. Writer-driven conclusions. The *writer-driven* conclusions were those based on the writer's view on the topic and as such, were subjective. This view could be presented in the different forms such as *advice*, *warning*, *wishing* and others. Since they all were as an outcome of writers' understanding of the topic (*prediction, result, unexpected result*) or their feelings and reactions towards it (*warning, rhetoric, advising, opinion, evaluation*), we could consider all of them under the umbrella term of writer's opinion. However, each of these opinion types had some linguistic elements that made it function somehow differently from each other. For example, although *advising* can be said to be the opinion of the writers as it is based on their reaction to the topic, its function is different from another type of conclusion such as *evaluation* which is value-laden and whose function is to assess something such as a proposition or an author's work. Therefore, all these *writer-driven* conclusions, although acknowledged to be part of the writers' opinion, were categorised based on their more prominent feature or function. In fact, writing books acknowledge the variety of strategies for ending a text and instruct learners to use them in their conclusions (Berms & Jones, 2008; Lagan, 2013; Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Meyers, 2013; Ruetten, 2011; Wyrick, 2008). Most of these categories of steps correspond to Henry and Roseberry's (1997) Expansion step, Hyland's (1990) Close step, Kusel's (1992) External Outcome, and Hüttner's (2010) findings on categories of concluding sentences.
In the following, each of these types of conclusions is explained and an example is provided.

1. Wishing. In this type of step, the writer wished for some action or some situation to occur. The key word was "*hope*" by having a frequency of 75%. Sometimes, there were religious wishes too (12.5%). This type of step, although not mentioned explicitly as one of the techniques for closing sentences in the writing textbooks and the studies on essays (all mentioned above), can still be considered to fall under the other researchers' steps of Expansion, Close, or External Outcomes because the writer tries to connect the topic to something beyond the text. The following is an example of such a step (in relation to the use of underlining here and subsequent similar cases, see Table 3.7, item 5.b):

Ex. 4.16:

"I hope that smokers realize the seriousness of smoking and they quit for their health." (PN.1.B)

2. Opinion. In this type of concluding step, the writer expressed her feelings and thoughts about the topic discussed. This is what Oshima and Hogue (2006) call 'comment' and others (Brems & Jones, 2008; Meyers, 2013) call 'opinion'. Below is an example:

Ex. 4.17:

"*We get money to spend it not to gather and put it next to us in casket*." (PN.60.E)

3. Advising. This kind of step included a piece of advice related to the topic. To facilitate categorisation and avoid creating too many concluding categories, sentences that indicated a suggestion, an obligation, an order, or moral of the topic discussed were all placed under this category. Henry and Roseberry (1997) call it 'advising' and it has been referred to as 'recommendation' (Lagan, 2013; Meyers, 2013; Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Wyrick, 2008), 'suggestion' (Brems & Jones, 2008), and 'solution' (Liu, 2015) too. The key words and phrases used were should, have to, and must. In fact, from a total of 70 conclusions categorised under this group, there were 20 cases of should (28.5%), 7 cases of have to (10%), and 6 of must (8.5%). The following is an example of such:

Ex. 4.18:

"*We must eat something include Vitamin A to be more healthy*." (PN.51.C)

4. Rhetoric. In this step, the writers made a rhetorical statement. They used the language to influence, convince, or please the readers. It has a force of speech and writer's presence is usually in form of giving an order. It can also be in form of a question whereby the writer is not seeking any answer but wants to criticise a situation or to make a point (Wyrick, 2008). Both Hüttner (2010) and Liu (2015) found this type of statements in their study and called them 'Appealing to the reader'. The following are examples of this type of conclusion. However, it needs to be remembered that these statements should be considered in the context of the whole text in order to be able to determine whether they are rhetorical or not. The following example has this feature:

Ex. 4.19:

"*People's lives should not be priced*." (PM.47.B)

5. Evaluation. Another concluding step used by the students was evaluating the topic, the reading text, or the writer's writing style. Hunston and Thompson (2001) define evaluation as being comparative, subjective and value-laden. Use of evaluative adjectives like good, bad, terrible can also be seen. The evaluating moves are seen in the genres of book reviews and book blurbs (e.g., Cacchiani, 2007; Suarez & Moreno, 2006). In the essay studies, Hüttner (2010) found this step in student essays and called it 'Qualifying and evaluating the reading paper' and Henry and Roseberry (1997) found this in both steps of the conclusion move (CI and EX).

Wyrick (2008) calls it 'evaluation of the importance of the subject' and considers it as an effective concluding step. Students in this study used adjectives such is important, great, good, and interesting in this type of conclusion as the example below demonstrates:

Ex. 4.20:

"Finally, I think it was an interesting topic to talk about and the writer way in writing was so awesome." (PN.34.B)

6. Result. Conclusion of this type is based on the readers' deduction of the information presented and is in the form of implications or results (Henry & Roseberry, 1997; Meyers, 2013; Oshima & Hogue, 2006; Wyrick, 2008). If this is directly drawn from the topic it may be considered as an objective conclusion, but if it is related to the actions or feelings evoked by the reading, it could be considered as a subjective conclusion (see the examples below). The discourse markers showing a result, such as hence, so, and as a result, were seen in 20% of the conclusions of this type. Also, the construct of X makes Y was seen in another 20% of these conclusions. The followings are some of these examples:

Ex. 4.21:

"*It is simply network of neurons that change every time we tell an event; so the memory of that event is affected by former retelling*." (PM. 26.A) (objective)

Ex. 4.22*:*

"These ideas which I got it after reading this article made me happy that there is no impossible in our life." (PM.29.A) (subjective)

7. Unexpected result. It is a type of concluding step in which the writer emphasises an unexpected result or puts forward a contrasting view to the idea discussed in the text. This type of conclusion is not explicitly mentioned in the writing textbooks or in the essay studies probably because it is a kind of result and falls under such category. However, I found it to be close to the idea of 'new information' (Kusel, 1992; Hüttner, 2010) as an unexpected result has an element of 'newness' that probably has not been mentioned in the body of the text which in turn makes it unexpected. This kind of conclusion comprised about 5% of all conclusions. Words such as although, even though, however, and but are seen in this type of conclusion (50%). Below is an example:

Ex. 4.23:

"*Finally, being left handed is consider as a unique thing, even though it can be difficult sometimes, but with whole lefty family like mine, you will not feel as a stranger*." (PM.18.D)

8. Prediction. In this concluding step, the writers made a prediction based on the content of their response (*Argument Move*). Most writing textbooks mention *prediction* in the list of effective strategies for conclusion (e.g., Brems & Jones, 2008; Ruetten, 2011; Wyrick, 2008). It was similarly seen in some essay studies too (e.g., Henry & Roseberry, 1997; Liu, 2015). Students in this study used the words such as if, may, will, when, once and would to signal their prediction. Use of modal verbs (will, may, might, could) to refer to future consequences was seen in 56% of these conclusions, followed by the use of if-clauses (20%), temporal clauses (made with words as, once, and whenever) (16%), and subordinators of concession (even though and although) (8%). The use of modal will to predict future outcomes was also seen in Henry and Roseberry's study too. The example below shows such a step:

Ex. 4.24:

"If we can understand and feel the pain of others then it is not possible that we will not feel obligated to remove them of that pain or in the least try and alleviate some of it." (PM.14.D)

9. Warning. In this type of concluding step, the writer gives a warning about the consequence of an action or situation. It is a kind of advice; however, while advice is to get a positive result the use of warning is to warn about the negative consequences if something is not done. The writing textbooks (as mentioned above) do not make any explicit reference to this type of conclusion probably because they consider it as a kind of result or advice. However, Henry and Roseberry (1997) found instances of this kind of conclusions and referred to it as 'admonishing'. Use of negative modal verbs such as should not and negative verbs or verbals were seen in this type of conclusion. From a total of 15 texts with this kind of conclusion, 20% had 'should not' and another 26.6% had negative verbs or verbals. The following is an example:

Ex. 4.25:

"I think parents should be more careful about them [their children] because if they didn't watch their kids they won't have a good generation." (PN.19.D)

Summary of the use of Move 3 in texts of different cognitive levels. Table 4.25 shows the summary of different types of conclusions and their usages in texts of each cognitive level.

Table 4.25

Summary of Different Types of Conclusion and Their Usage in Texts of Each Cognitive Level

Levels of Cognition→ Types of conclusion↓	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total
Summarizing	5 *(16.1%)*	5 *(3.9%)*	4 *(3.7%)*	1 *(5.2%)*	15 *(5.3%)*
Restating	4 *(12.9%)*	10 *(7.9%)*	0 *(0%)*	1 *(5.2%)*	15 *(5.3%)*
Wishing	1 *(3.2%)*	3 *(2.3%)*	10 *(9.3%)*	2 *(10.5%)*	16 *(5.6%)*
Opinion	4 *(12.9%)*	30 *(23.8%)*	19 *(17.7%)*	2 *(10.5%)*	55 *(19.5%)*
Advising	6 *(19.3%)*	30 *(23.8%)*	28 *(26.1%)*	6 *(31.5%)*	70 *(24.8%)*
Rhetoric	0 *(0%)*	3 *(2.3%)*	9 *(8.4%)*	1 *(5.2%)*	13 *(4.6%)*
Evaluation	1 *(3.2%)*	12 *(9.5%)*	7 *(6.6%)*	0 *(0%)*	20 *(7%)*
Result	3 *(9.6%)*	14 *(11.1%)*	7 *(6.5%)*	1 *(5.2%)*	25 *(8.8%)*
Unexpected result	1 *(3.2%)*	8 *(6.3%)*	5 *(4.6%)*	0 *(0%)*	14 *(4.9%)*
Prediction	4 *(12.9%)*	8 *(6.3%)*	12 *(11.2%)*	1 *(5.2%)*	25 *(8.8%)*
Warning	2 *(6.4%)*	3 *(2.3%)*	6 *(5.6%)*	4 *(21%)*	15 *(5.3%)*
Total	31 *(100%)*	126 *(100%)*	107 *(100%)*	19 *(100%)*	282 *(100%)*

The next section shows how these concluding steps were used in texts of different cognitive levels.

Move 3 in texts of level 1 cognition. Overall, about 10.9% of all concluding sentences belonged to level 1 texts. The most used steps were *advising* (19.3%), followed by *summarising* (16.1%), *restating*, *opinion*, and *prediction* (each 12.9%). Use of *summarising* and *restating* was expected to be seen in texts of this level as they are *text-driven* steps and require lower level of cognition but use of *advising* and *opinion* was surprising because in this level the presence of writer is minimal. An explanation can be that the writers just narrated the reading text and these were in fact the authors' conclusions (or a paraphrase of them) not the writers'. There was not any *rhetorical* step seen probably because in this level writers' presence is marginal and as such there is no persuasion and influencing of audience, which would otherwise highlight their presence.

Move 3 in texts of level 2 cognition. About 44.6% of all conclusions belonged to texts of this level. This was the only level that all types of concluding steps were seen. The concluding steps of *advising* and *opinion* had the most frequencies (23.8% each), with *result* (11.1%) and *evaluation* (9.5%) following respectively. Since this level shows writers' interpretation and literal judgment, use of *writer-driven* conclusions was expected; therefore, high usage of *advising* and *opinion* is probably related to the evaluation of the subject and suggestions related

to the topic. Use of *text-driven* conclusions (*summarising* and *restating*) was lower (12%) than those in level 1 (29%) seemingly due to the use of more interpretational and subject-driven conclusions in this level. *Wishing, warning*, and *rhetoric* were the least used (2.3% each), probably because they require a higher level of writer visibility and subjectivity (e.g., use of first person pronouns).

Move 3 in texts of level 3 cognition. This level ranked second in having the most concluding sentences (37.9%) in the data. *Advising* (26.1%), *opinion* (17.7%), *prediction* (11.2%), and *wishing* (9.3%) were the most used types of concluding steps respectively. All of these sentences are *writer-driven* and fall mostly under the subjective conclusions. Use of *advising* and *wishing* conclusions is higher than those in texts of levels 1 and 2 showing more writer presence. Surprisingly, use of *opinion* is lower in this level compared to level 2. An explanation could be that in level 2 the writers had their agreement/disagreement with the author later in the text in the conclusion part. Another explanation is the high rise in the other *writer-driven* concluding sentence types in level 3. For example, the *rhetorical* sentences were used four times more here (the highest in the whole data) than in level 2. The least used steps were *unexpected result* (4.6%) and *summarising* (3.7%). *Restating* was not used at all, again probably showing that the writers were more personally involved in the texts of this level.

Move 3 in texts of level 4 cognition. Only 6.7% of all concluding sentences belonged to this level. *Advising* (31.5%) and *warning* (21%) were by far, the two most frequently used concluding steps, constituting more than half of the texts. This was expected as the *Argument Move* of these texts was on presenting a problem and offering a solution or calling for action usually done in the *Conclusion Move* of these texts in forms of *advising* and *warning*. Although it was expected to see more of *rhetoric* step in the texts of this level as to call for an action one has to pursue others and use the language powerfully to influence people, there was only one case (5.2%) of this kind of conclusion. Also, it was expected to have more of *prediction* (5.2%) type of conclusions as they would state the actions to be done or should be done in the future but perhaps use of *warning* did both functions of *prediction* and *warning*. Use of *text-driven* conclusions, *summary* and *restating*, was higher here than those in level 3, which might mean by presenting the problem and offering a suggestion or calling for an action in the *Argument Move*, the writers opted to just summarise the text at the end or just focus on the main idea of the text

and reaffirm it. *Unexpected result* and *evaluation* steps were not used in texts of this level at all probably due to the small sample size in this level.

After presenting the findings related to the reader response genre and discussing all the moves and steps found, I will now present the findings on the third question of this study, about the use of personal pronouns in reader responses.

SECTION 3

4.3 Use of Personal Pronouns for Self-representation and Reader Engagement and Their Rhetorical Functions

The third question of this study related to the use of personal pronouns for self-representation and reader engagement and their rhetorical functions. The findings are presented in the sections that follow.

A reader response, by definition, is concerned with the responses of readers to a text they have read. Therefore, the responses typically show the opinions of the writer (readers) towards the reading texts by utilising different linguistic devices one of which is the use of personal pronouns. In fact, writers' use of first person pronouns shows their presence (Hyland, 2001 & 2005) or their 'voice' (Ivanič & Camps, 2001) in the text and different identities and roles they might be having. Also, the writer might be interacting with the audience by the use of 'we' and 'you' as an engagement strategy (Hyland, 2005).

A pronoun is defined as "a complex element of language that rarely stands in a simple relationship to other aspects of language" (Pennycook, as cited in Okamura, 2009). Use of personal pronouns is an indicator of writers' presence (Hyland, 2001) and how they view social relationships, including themselves, others, and community (Okamura, 2011). Typically, the personal pronouns that show the writer's presence are first person pronouns and those used for interaction with the audience are second person pronouns. This, however, is a simplistic approach to the categorisation of pronouns. This section will illustrate the inherent complexity of pronoun use and rhetorical functions in student responses and explore the connections that seemed to be present between pronoun use and levels of cognitive engagement.

4.3.1 Frequency of the personal pronouns in texts of different cognitive levels.

The data analysis showed (see Table 4.26) the different frequencies for the use of the first and second person pronouns, in all their forms (subjective, objective, possessive adjective, possessive pronouns, reflexive), in texts belonging to each cognitive level.

Table 4.26

Frequency of Personal Pronouns in Texts of Both Groups of Students according to the Cognitive Level

Cognitive levels→ Pronouns↓	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
I	25	164	588	22
Me	5	20	96	3
My	9	45	245	6
Mine	0	0	2	0
Myself	0	1	9	2
Total	*(39) 18.6%*	*(230) 38.8%*	*(940) 62.2%*	*(33) 25.5%*
We	22	88	176	39
Us	10	32	43	13
Our	27	54	97	13
Ours	0	0	0	0
Ourselves	1	5	7	1
Total	*(60) 28.4%*	*(179) 30.2%*	*(323) 21.3%*	*(66) 51.1%*
You (subject)	51	101	133	17
You (object)	21	28	37	5
Your	38	44	70	6
Yours	0	0	0	1
Yourself	2	10	9	1
Total	*(112) 53.5%*	*(183) 30.9%*	*(249) 16.4%*	*(30) 23.4%*
Grand total	*211 100%*	*592 100%*	*1512 100%*	*129 100% = 2250*

There are general conclusions that can be drawn from these frequencies:

1. Overall, subjective cases (‘I’, ‘we’, ‘you’) were more frequent than any other pronouns.

2. From a total of 1426 subjective cases, ‘I’ had the highest frequency (799=56%), while ‘we’ (325=22.7%), and ‘you’ (302=21.1%) followed next respectively.

2. Possessive adjective pronouns (my, our, your) were more frequent than object pronouns (me, us, you).

3. The reflexive pronouns had the lowest frequency among others, with ‘yourself’ being the most used (22 cases) and ‘myself’ the least (12 cases).

4. Use of possessive cases (mine, yours, ours) was almost non-existent in all texts except for ‘yours’ (once) and ‘mine’ (twice).

These findings resonate with findings of some studies on other genres. Rodriguez et al's study (2011) on Mexican undergraduate students' argumentative essays, for example, showed that 'I' and 'we' were used 87.3% of the instances while objective and possessive cases were used only 12.7% of the time. A similar finding, although with different types of data, was observed in Okamura's (2011) study on the use of personal pronouns in academic lectures and scientific articles. She found that pronouns 'I', 'you', and 'we' were used more often in lectures than in scientific papers. However, 'I' and 'you' were used more than 'we' in lectures than in scientific papers. She concluded that the high usages of 'I' and 'you' in lectures show the interactive genre of lectures. Similarly, Yeo and Ting (2014) assert that the use of 'you' and 'I' in lecture introductions- especially when lecturers share their experiences with their students- is an effort from the lecturers to establish a rapport with their audiences. In this data, we noticed that these responses had a frequent use of 'you'. This may possibly be related to the reader response genre which is quite interactive in nature. I will return to this discussion later in the chapter.

Due to higher frequencies of the three subjective personal pronouns (I, you, we) across the four cognitive levels, it was decided to explore this further by looking more closely at the data. Therefore, the focus of this study was only on these three personal pronouns in their subjective form to analyse them further for their usages and rhetorical functions in texts of different cognitive levels.

4.3.2 Personal pronouns in texts of different cognitive levels: uses and functions of first person singular.

In what follows, findings related to the use of personal pronouns for self-representation and their rhetorical functions (in text of each cognitive level) are presented by first discussing the first person singular pronoun, followed by the first person plural and finally the second person pronoun. The categorisations of discourse functions are illustrated using examples from the student responses.

Pronoun 'I' in texts of level 1 cognition. The analysis of the texts in Level 1 cognition showed that all twenty-five instances of 'I' were in its personal usage – 'I' the writer. Looking more closely at the texts, the functions of 'I' were varied. The writers used it to *express their opinion* (termed 'opinion-holder' by Tang & John, 1999); to *show being recipient of the effect of reading* (expressing 'self-benefit' as used by Hyland, 2002), which had two sub-types of

'demonstrating a new understanding as a result of reading' (Thonney, 2013) or as an emotive reaction 'showing their feeling towards the experience of reading the text' and learning about the author's ideas; and *to mention a personal quality or an experience to support the author's ideas* (Thonney, 2013) (in relation to the use of italics with rhetorical functions henceforward, refer to Table 3.7, item 3.b).To determine the rhetorical functions of 'I', use of verbs that collocated with it were crucial. Using the concordancer, the frequencies of verbs were calculated (for more detail on frequency of each verb and its percentage refer to Appendix J, Table J1). Table 4.27 below presents the usage and functions of 'I' found in these texts (in relation to the use of single and double underlining in student texts hereafter, see Table 3.7, items 5.b-c and 6).

Table 4.27

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'I' in Texts of Level 1Cognitive Engagement

Usage	Functions	Frequency & %	Linguistic cues	Example
Personal	1. Expressing an opinion	18 (72%)	Verbs of cognition(e.g., agree, believe, think, guess)	*"I totally agree with the author in his point of views and with the fact about Muslim's deep love and admiration for Prophet Mohammad."* (PN.58.B)
	2. Being recipient of an effect from reading: a) demonstration of an understanding	5 (20%) [4]	-Verbs of cognition (e.g., see, know)	a) *"In this article, I know [learned] many things that I have been know it before."* (PM. 31.C)
	b) feelings towards the text/author	[1]	-Adjectives of feelings (impressed) -Noun (feeling)	b) *"For my part, I can express my feeling about the story 'the man who loved women'. That both of them there are happiest lovers in future comes*" (PN.31.A)
	3. Mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support the author's idea	2 (8%)	Verbs (am, was, like)	*"….. . Moreover, I like friend who is supportive. Also help me when I am in troubles and keep my secret."* (PN.7.E)
Total		25 (100%)		

It should be remembered that in the examples given above for each function of 'I', the instance of 'I' that has a specific function is underlined. The other instances of 'I', those not underlined, are categorised under other functions (in fact, this approach is taken with all these three pronouns). For instance, in the above example, *"In this article, I know [learned] many things that I have been know it before"*, the student uses *I know many things* to mean that after reading this article, she learned many things of which she had some prior knowledge. Therefore,

use of "*I know"* was categorised under the function of *being recipient of an effect of reading,* while the use of "*I have been know* [had known]" was placed under the function of *expressing a personal quality* because it expressed having a personal quality, a state of having knowledge about something (in relation to the use of single and double underlining hereafter, see Table 3.7, items 5.b and 6).

As mentioned earlier, determining the function of 'I' depended on analysing the context in which it was used. As Bhatia (1997) mentions some linguistic forms have different functions and some other can have only one; therefore, reference to context is necessary to determine the discourse values of linguistic form or device. For example, in the following script, categorisation of 'I' needed thorough examination of the context of use.

Ex. 4.26:

"I am impressed with the idea of the article that established Japanese history." (PN.41.B)

It was determined that the use of "*am*" here was not enough to put the function of 'I' under function 3, *mentioning a personal quality or an experience*, showing a permanent personal quality of being *"impressed"* but it belonged to function 2, *being recipient of an effect of reading* (*feelings towards the text/author*), as it shows the writer is expressing her feeling towards the content of the reading passage (being impressed).

Lack of use of impersonal 'I' in these texts supports the findings of Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990). They found that in general the impersonal use of the pronoun 'I' is considerably lower than those of pronouns 'you' and 'we', and it is mainly used in hypothetical situation, which was not found in this data. In terms of the functions of 'I', students used it to *express their opinion* more frequently (72%) than to show *being recipient of an effect of reading* (20%), and *mentioning a personal quality or an experience* (8%) (for more examples of its functions see the concordances lines on pronoun 'I' in Appendix N). Since in level 1 cognition the writer merely retells or reports what is discussed in the reading text, the verbs that collocated with 'I' in the opinion category were believe, think, agree and am [sure that] and not disagree or negative forms of these verbs (e.g., I don't agree with the author, or I don't think what the author said is right) (for more see Appendix J, Table J1). This may imply that these combinations (I think, I believe, I agree) are used as a strategy, a starting point for the students allowing them then to only repeat the author's idea. They did not use words showing disagreement since to disagree one needs to

argue and bring her own reasoning from the text and from outside the text. This would possibly draw on a higher cognitive process.

Use of 'I' was lower in texts of this level of cognition than those of levels 2 and 3 (refer to Table 4. 26 above). Two possible explanations for the low frequency of pronoun 'I' might relate to the focus of the writer (whether on the message or on the interpersonal relation) and the stance of the writer. Tennen (1983, as cited in Petch-Tyson 1998, p. 107) asserts that "the degree to which interpersonal involvement or message content carries the signalling load" determines the type of register, whether it is spoken or written language. That is, in conversation and spoken language, personal involvement carries the signalling load while in written language, the content or message serves this purpose. In authentic spoken and written communication, there is a balance of both (personal relation and content); however, many writers downplay the role of personal involvement by emphasising the topic (message). It seems that in texts of this level, the writers focused on the message of the reading text instead of connecting it to their own personal experiences, a quality which is usually typical of a reader response. Moreover, first and second personal pronouns are indicators of an interpersonal relationship between the writers and readers (Hyland, 2005; Natsukari, 2012; Petch-Tyson, 1998), which can hardly be used if one is just paraphrasing or describing the reading text as is the case in texts of this level of cognition. In Natsukari's study (2012) on the use of first person pronouns in Japanese EFL students' essays and comparing it with those of their British and American counterparts, it was observed that both British and American students used 'I' to write about their opinions, but Americans also used it to write about their personal experiences. Natsukari also analysed the rhetorical aspect of the student texts and found that some used 'I' frequently, some occasionally, and some not at all. The ones using it frequently did it mostly to argue the issue from a personal experience; the ones occasionally using it were presenting a personal experience as one of the points made in the course of an argument. The students without any usage of 'I' looked at the argument objectively. But in texts of level 1 cognition the writer is simply reiterating the author's ideas and there is lack of arguments which may account for the low frequency of 'I'.

Overall, it is possible to describe the writer in this level as having a passive role, as a *reporter* or an *announcer* (in relation to the use of italics here and subsequent similar cases, see Table 3.7, item 3.b).

Pronoun 'I' in texts of level 2 cognition. In this level, there was evidence of a wider range of discourse functions of the first person pronoun. The analysis showed that unlike level 1, there were two usages of pronoun 'I': personal (156=95.2%) and impersonal (8=4.8%). That is, while the referent in the personal use was the writer, the referent in some of the uses was other pronouns or people than the writer. This was usually seen in quotations referring to a speaker, who was not the writer. The functions of the first person singular pronoun were *expressing an opinion, being recipient of an effect from reading* (the four sub-functions were demonstration of an understanding from reading, feeling towards the text/author, showing uncertainty, experiencing the reading itself), *mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support or reject the author's idea*, and *referring to others* (in quotations). For the functions of the 'I', verbs collocating with it were analysed and their frequency calculated (for more detail on frequency of each verb and its percentage refer to Appendix J, Table J2). Table 4.28 below illustrates the functions of 'I' and an example of each function.

Table 4.28

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'I' in Texts of Level 2 Cognitive Engagement

Usage	Functions	Frequency &%	Linguistic cues	Example
Personal (95.2%)	1. Expressing an opinion, belief, wish	78 (47.5%)	Verbs of cognition (e.g., agree, believe, am, think, guess, hope, suggest)	a) using verbs of cognitive processing to repeat the author's idea: *"From my point of view, I think that vitamin D is now becoming a worldwide health problem."* (PM. 52.B) b) using verbs of cognitive processing to bring their own idea (from their prior factual or life knowledge): *"I think that she will be generous if she was born in a moderate family*." (PN.3.E)
	2. Being recipient of an effect from reading: a) demonstration of an understanding	57 (34.7%) [23]	-Verbs of cognition (e.g., see, inferred, figure, was informed, noticed)	*a)"After I read her story [Marilyn Monroe], I figure even if she has a bad personality and did a very bad things, she was a strong woman*." (PN.13.D) b) "*It is a really great story. I like it a lot because it simplify the idea to the children, make it easier to understand and learn from it."* (PM.22.C)
	b) feeling towards the text/author	[19] [10]	-Verbs of cognition (like, didn't like, love) and perception (feel)	c) *"After I read this article, I wonder*

	c) showing uncertainty d) experience of the reading	[5]	Adjectives (the best, surprised) -Verbs of cognition (wonder, don't know how, could never understand) - Verbs of activity (e.g., say, read) and relational verbs(wasn't used to, was influenced)	*how it [brain] can be preserved from the ancient time."* (PM.29.A) d) *"This is the first work I read by Kafka. For that reason I can fairly say that it took me some time to absorb and relate this kind of surrealistic stories which I am not used to reading."* (PM.37.B)
	3. Mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support or reject the author's idea	20 (12.1%)	Verbs of cognition (e.g., remember, don't get, know, want, care), relational verbs (am, was, have)	*"The writer here mentioned that friends have to be almost in the same status which is not true since …. .In my real life, I have some good friends of different status whereas the economic disparity does not affect on our relationship."* (PM.16.C) (Personal quality) "*Most commonly, 'life event' play a big role in causing depressed mood. They affect the person's mind, thoughts and behavior. I got depressed when my father died four years ago. It was reactive depression. I lost my appetite and had problems in taking decisions and controlling my life. All depression kinds are not the same."* (PM.38.A) (Experience)
Impersonal (4.8%)	4. Referring to others	8 (4.8%)	- Direct or indirect speech	"*Iben Battoteh said "describe geographical location I will describe inhabitants."* (PM.46.A)
Total		164 (100%)		

As in level 1, the function of 'I' as the *expressing opinion* had the most frequency (47.5%). I placed the statements of wishing and hoping (4 cases) in this category since it reveals the writers' opinions on a subject and their hopes for a certain course of action to take place. Unlike the level 1 texts, here students showed their disagreement with the author's idea (e.g., "*I disagree with Terry Hall in his opinion about smoking*." PM.15.D). As is the feature of texts of this level, writers show signs of reasoning, and try to connect the content to their prior factual and world knowledge to accommodate the new information and its comprehension (Weigle, 2002). The data shows that if they felt they were not sure of their understanding, they signalled this by using words that convey uncertainty (e.g., I wonder) (Chang, 2006; Grabe, 1991).

Thonney (2013) found that writers used 'I' when they wanted to show their uncertainty. Use of this function, as Herriman (2007) argues shows writer's authorial self. Herriman using Ivanič's ideas of three aspects of writer identity found that use of 'I' for the writer opinion was highest in the texts of non-native students compared to native speaker students. This showed the writers' stance toward the subject of discussion. She concluded that these students had a stronger authorial presence.

Use of the function of *being recipient of an effect from reading* (Hyland, 2002) was the second most used function in this cognitive level (34.7%). Hyland (2002) found this function of 'I' in his study too. Similarly, Herriman (2007) found this function to occur more in expert writers' texts (opinion and comment articles) than the student writers'. She considered this as an effective appeal strategy that writers use to persuade their readers (for more examples see the concordancer lines of the functions of 'I' in Appendix N).

The third most used function of 'I' was *mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support or reject the author's idea (12.1%).* Bringing examples of personal experience has been found in other studies too (e.g., Herriman, 2007; Natsukari, 2012; Thonney, 2013). This can be considered as what Ivanič called autobiographical self, the writer's use of actions and events outside the text. As can be seen in the examples of function 3 in the above table, in the first one the writer (PM.16.C) shows her disagreement with the author and brings a fact from her own situation, a personal quality of having friends, to refute the author's idea. In the second example, the writer (PM. 38.A) brings her own personal experience to show her support for the author's proposition. This can also be related to what others found for the function of 'I' as to show expertise (Herriman, 2007; Thonney, 2013). Also Jacob (2002, as cited in Lareaus et al, 2006) explains in the 'inquiry process', students solve the problem (writing) by using their personal experiences and world knowledge to support their arguments, negate or generalise a point, to take a position and to predict an argument. The last function found in texts of this level was *referring to others*, with a frequency of 4.8%.

Overall, in this level, the pronoun 'I' is typically used to signal some interpretation of the content. The writer's role could therefore be seen as mainly that of *interpreter* or *translator*, by which (disregarding the semantic difference of these two words) it is meant the writer tries to convey a message from the sender (author) to the receiver (reader) with a slight personal involvement in the process.

Pronoun 'I' in texts of level 3 cognition. In this level, the variety of verb collocates of the pronoun 'I' makes the writer's presence in the text more pronounced. Like in texts of level 2, there were two usages of pronoun 'I': personal (579= 98.47%) and impersonal (9=1.53%). The functions of 'I' here were mostly the same as those in level 2 but with one deletion (*interpretation: showing uncertainty*) and one addition (*doer*). Analysis of the texts showed that students used 'I' to *express their opinions*, to *show the effect of reading the texts* (including sub-functions of demonstration of an understanding, feeling towards the text/author, experience of the reading itself), to *mention a personal quality or a personal experience as a support for approval or disapproval of the author's point*, to refer to oneself as *the doer of some action*, and to *referring to others.* The function of 'I' as *the doer of some action* can be considered to be similar to what Thonney found 'relating personally' or to show one's 'expertise' (Herriman, 2007; Thonney, 2013). For the functions of 'I', verbs collocating with it were analysed and their frequency calculated (for more detail on frequency of each verb and its percentage refer to Appendix J, Table J3). The functions of 'I', their frequency and examples are given in Table 4.29 below.

Table 4.29
Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'I' in Texts of Level 3 Cognitive Engagement

Usage	Functions	Frequency &%	Linguistic cues	Example
Personal (99%)	1. Expressing an opinion, belief, wish	155 (26.3%)	Verbs of cognition (e.g., can't agree, believe, think, guess, wish, suggest, disagree, hope)	*"I do not believe in the word stupid, but in the case of stress I believe it can make me stupid."* (PM.19.B)
	2. Being recipient of an effect from reading: a) demonstration of an understanding	60 (10.2%) [21]	- Verbs of cognition (e.g., thought, see, learned, realize, know, found)	a) *"The most important thing I have learned from this story was to be grateful, and thank Allah for his blessings."* (PM.47.D)
	b) feeling towards the text/author	[16]	-Verbs of cognition (e.g., like, respect, enjoyed), perception (felt), -Adjectives (e.g., good, surprised, excited, interested)	b) *"I respect the writer and his estimated to the human feeling."* (PN.4.E)
	c) experience of the reading	[23]	- Verbs of activity (e.g., tried, wrote, prevent, organize) -Time clauses (e.g., after I read…, when I	c) *"*After I read this page *on BCC News, I don't prevent myself from drinking two cups of coffee a day anymore."* (PM.45.E)

			was reading….)	
	3. Mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support/refute the author's idea	351 (59.5%)	Relational verbs (am, was, have, had), and cognitive verbs (e.g., remember, know, want [positive and negative forms]	*"I am able to experience things that is new and unique."* (PM.35.C) (Personal quality) *"Keeping a diary don't really important but it is amazing. I remember I wrote a diary when I was 14 years old".*(PN.52.E) (Experience)
	4. As the 'doer' of some action	16 (2.7%)	-Modal verbs (e.g., have to, can , could, will, may, might) -Verbs of cognition and activity (prevent, control, want, pretend, encourage, eat)	*"For my final writing in class, which will be in the next week, I should write a comparison or contrast essay."* (PM.50.C)
Imperson al (1%)	5. Referring to others	6 (1%)	In quotations	*"One of the standup comedian said "I don't stop eating when I'm full, food is not over! I stop when I CAN NOT eat more."* (PM.11.E)
Total		588 (100%)		

There were a few observations about the texts in this level:

1. The function of *expressing an opinion* was found in texts of this level too. Clark and Ivanič (1997, as cited in Rodriquez et al, 2011) besides other researchers (e.g., Tang & John, 1999) assert that writers use 'I' to make a statement of value and belief. In addition to this function, the other function of *being the recipient of an effect from reading* seen in texts of levels 1 and 2 was also found here; however, its sub-function, *showing uncertainty*, which was found in level 2 texts was not seen here. It appeared as though the students' reliance on personal experiences did not seem to create room for any uncertainty about the content of the reading or vice versa. This may imply that the content was clear to them in such a way that they could not only understand it well but were also able to relate it to themselves and others.

2. The most frequent functions of 'I' were *mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support or reject the author's idea*, *expressing an opinion*, *being a recipient of the effect of reading*, *doer of an action*, and *referring to others respectively* (see the above table for percentages of frequency and refer to Appendix M, Table M1 for a comparison of the functions in all cognitive levels). The explanation for the high usage of *mentioning a personal quality or an experience* function is the main feature of texts in this cognitive level. Clark and Ivanič (1997, in Rodriquez et al, 2011) also consider one of the functions of 'I' to be for presenting a personal

experience. One way that writers use personal experiences is by interpreting the content in light of their own or others' experiences or their own state of being and having. Another method involves the writers' use of personal experiences either as a support or rejection of the author's ideas (Jacob, 2002, as cited in Lareaus et al, 2006).

3. Also, the texts categorised in this level demonstrate the highest use of function of *mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support or reject the author's idea* (59.5%) compared to those in levels 1 and 2 texts (8% and 12.1% respectively). Again, this indicates that the students were connecting the content to themselves more by explaining about their own state of being and having or their own personal experiences. This is in line with Natsukari's (2012) finding that writers use 'I' for expressing personal matters. A similar finding was seen in Herriman's study (2007) where professional writers showed their autobiographical self (52%) more than student writers. She attributed this to the professional writers' persuasive strategies of making their claims and arguments sound rational and credible. She explains that writers' first-hand experience of the topic being discussed could be used as establishing credibility, establishing membership in a socio-cultural, political, or religious group with shared beliefs and interests and establishing writers' personal qualities (e.g., good judgment, intelligence, character, expertise) as a means to validate their claims. Hrisonopulo (2007) mentions that use of 'I' in the context of personal experiences conveys a sense of certainty about the writer's self to the reader. Therefore, we can agree with her that the use of personal experiences is a strategy by the writers to assure the readers about the rationality or credibility of the argument they are trying to make. However, we might also conclude that this phenomenon seen in texts of level 3 might show students have enough proficiency and confidence in their writing to approach the writing task like the professional writers in Herriman's study did. This can further be used to show the relationship that exists between writing and cognition; the more proficient a person is in writing, the more likely he or she is to use autobiographical self by connecting the content to self or others around her.

In fact, Rodriguez et al (2011) mention writer's level of language proficiency as one of the factors in the use of first person pronouns for referring to personal experiences. Use of more outside reading text materials and bringing one's own personal experience, can be a sign of the students' level of confidence in their writing skills. This might make more sense when we compare the use of first person pronoun here with that in texts of level 1.

The least used function of 'I' (1%) was for *referring to others*, which was lower than that in texts of level 2 (4.8%). This might seem somewhat surprising as the texts of this level show the highest level of writer involvement and also high usage of personal experiences, and one might expect to see more reported speech to have been used in the texts in the context of a personal experience (e.g., talking about a conversation or reporting an incident).

4. Another feature of the texts in this level is the high frequency of past tense verbs. The fact that a big portion of the verbs (30.7%) were in past tense forms shows that the students might be using this tense to reflect on their own past experiences. This ties in with what Ivanič and Camps (2001) explained in the use of ideational positioning. They mentioned that texts can show writers' reference to their own role and actions in constructing their knowledge and understanding and showing their responsibility for their opinion. They believe that a more radical view of knowledge-making is rooted in lived experience, whether the writers' or others'. The realisation of this type of knowledge is action verbs with human subjects, in recounts of activities done is specific time and setting (often past tense), in reference to experiences, and usually, the use of the first person as a main participant in the activities (Ivanič & Camps, 2001) (for more on percentages of verbs collocating with 'I' refer to Appendix J, Table J3 and for more examples refer to the concordancer lines of the functions of 'I' in Appendix N). The relatively high usage of modal verbs might suggest the writers' interactional positioning and involvement with the texts by showing their attitudes (Hyland, 2005; Petch-Tyson, 1998).

The texts in this level appear to show more writer presence than the texts of levels 1 and 2. Looking at the functions of 'I' in this cognitive level, it seems that writer has a role of *narrator* of a personal experience or a *counsellor*.

Pronoun 'I' in texts of level 4 cognition. An observation about the use of 'I' in texts of this level is its low frequency compared to those in texts of levels 2 and 3. As a result of this, and also due to the relatively small size of texts in this level, only one usage, personal, and 2 functions of 'I' were found. The most frequent function of 'I' was the *expressing an opinion (77.2%)*, although there were new ways in which opinions were demonstrated (use of 'I' with rather, don't blame, know) that were not seen in the texts of other levels. The other function of 'I' was *being the recipient of an effect from reading*. For the functions of 'I', verbs collocating with it were analysed and their frequency calculated (for more detail on frequency of each verb

and its percentage refer to Appendix J, Table J4).Table 4.30 shows the functions of 'I' in this level.

Table 4.30

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'I' in Texts of Level 4 Cognitive Engagement

Usage	Functions	Frequency &%	Linguistic cues	Example
Personal (100%)	1. Expressing an opinion, belief, wish	17 (77.2%)	Verbs of cognition (e.g., agree, think, suggest, hope, understand, know) and modal (would rather)	*"That's why I [would] rather depend on pills than force myself to eat something I don't like."* (PM.60.B)
	2. Being recipient of an effect from reading: a) feeling towards the text/author b) experience of the reading	5 (22.7%)	- Verbs of cognition (e.g., pride, think) - Verbs of cognition (thank, thought)	a) *"Then, it brought me to the present time. I thought of all the spring the Arab world has undergone."* (PM.3.D) b) *"I thank Allah [God] that I live in such peace and safety surrounded by people that fear Allah and recall that he's always watching them."* (PM.60.D)
Total		22		

As mentioned previously, students' texts in this cognitive level not only show their understanding of the texts read but also how they relate the issues discussed to possible actions they think need to be taken. Since the latter is a call for an action, it seems that the students felt safer to use first person plural pronoun (we) to present their suggestion rather than venture alone by using 'I' (this will be discussed later on the use of pronoun 'we'). This may explain the low usage of 'I' in texts of this level in general. The act of *expressing an opinion* seems to have acted as a springboard for the students to first present their opinion and then advocate something in more general terms and voice (inclusive-we). This is expected since use of 'I' to call for a collective action would need writers' confidence in their authority and power, assertions that EFL students as inexperienced writers may try to avoid (Thonney, 2013). In fact, there were 3 instances of use of 'I' for calling for an action, while there were 6 cases of 'we' addressing people in form of advising them on taking an action to help themselves or their society (for more examples of each function refer to the concordancer lines of the use of 'I' in Appendix N). Beside these, the high usage of this discourse function (expressing an opinion) is similar to that in Herriman's study (2007) where students (native and non-native) used this aspect of authorial

self more than professional writers. Herriman concludes that "the students' presence tends to be that of opinionated writers relying on emphasis as their chief means of persuasion." (p. 14). In brief, it can be said that considering the use of 'I' which is mainly for expressing opinion, and the texts in this level showing the writers' effort in connecting the reading content to other issues and calling for actions, the role of the writer seems to be that of an *advocate*.

A summary of the uses and rhetorical functions of 'I'. A summary table showing the use and functions of pronoun 'I' in texts of different cognitive levels is presented in Appendix M, Table M1. It is clear that personal usage of 'I' was dominant in texts of all levels, while the impersonal usage of 'I' was only seen in texts of levels 2 and 3. Similarly, more functions of 'I' were found in texts of levels 3 and 2 respectively and the least was for texts of level 4. The reason for the use of more functions in texts of levels 2 and 3 is probably due to a) the greater frequency of this pronoun in these texts and b) the nature of these texts. Level 2 texts show interpretational efforts of the students. A sub-function of this interpretation is showing uncertainty about the content. Thonney (2013) examined students' term papers and compared them with texts of expert writers. She found that unlike experts, student writers used first person pronouns not to express authority but rather to show their uncertainty, personal benefits, and their inferior status with regard to their instructors. When students were asked to analyse written texts, they refrained from using 'I' and 'we' probably to avoid presenting their ideas beside the experts' ideas. In this study, students used 'I' to show their uncertainty too; however, my findings on the function of *being recipient of effects of reading* and *expressing an opinion* (opinion-holder*)* are different from those in some other studies (e.g., Hyland, 2002; Tang & John, 1999; Thonney, 2013). Use of 'I' to *express an opinion* by signalling agreement or disagreement was one of the most commonly used techniques in introductory sentences of student responses. One of the genre roles of first person pronouns that Tang and John (1999) found in student writings was the role of 'opinion-holder'. In their study, like this one, 'I' and 'we' usually collocated with verbs showing cognitive processes like think and believe. However, unlike the students in this study, students in their study used this genre role less than some others (4 instances out of 92 [4.3%]). The reason for this might have been due to it being a high-risk function, requiring students to venture and present their ideas to an expert (Hyland, 2002;

Thonney, 2013). In the reader response genre, however, due to its openness, students used this function more often, which is consistent with Herriman's study too.

Also, use of 'I' to show *being the recipient of an effect of reading* was used often in texts of levels 2 and 3. Thonney (2013) believes that this function shows the least authorial power and that it is not seen in the texts of expert writers, but Herriman (2007) believes expert writers use autobiographical self more than novice writers. This difference of analysis might be related to the genres they studied. However, Herriman (2007) agrees that use of description (e.g., describing the effect of reading) is a low risk factor with low authorial power because it lacks creativity and novelty.

Overall, a survey of college students found that students perceive using 'I' to show their interpretation, understanding, and knowledge to the teacher as an expected behaviour (Melzer, 2009). These functions (*interpretation*, *understanding*, *showing uncertainty*) are found most frequently in texts of level 2. We could say that use of authorial self is more seen in texts of levels 2 and 3. The reason that *showing an understanding* was not found in level 4 texts or *showing uncertainty* was not found in texts of levels 3 and 4 could be that the reading texts or the topics were familiar to the students and clear for their understanding, which did not require much interpretational efforts from them.

Also, the most used verbs collocating with pronoun 'I' were: think, believe, agree, be, have/had, like, used to, read, and some modals (can, should, have to, must, may). They comprised 54.98% of all verbs (for their frequencies refer to Appendix J, Table J5).
After discussing the use of 'I' in texts of different cognitive levels, I now turn to the use and functions of 'we' in these texts.

4.3.3 Uses and rhetorical functions of the first person plural pronoun.

Like the studies on pronoun 'I' mentioned in the Literature Review Chapter, most studies on pronoun 'we' focused on the uses and functions of it in academic speech and writing. Since this study is on a written mode, the uses of 'we' are categorised as inclusive-we, referring to all people, and exclusive-we, referring to the writer and others (I & They). Moreover, like pronoun 'I', in this study usages and functions of 'we' were considered based on the categories of the level of cognitive involvement.

Pronoun 'we' in texts of level 1 cognition. There were overall 10 texts in this level that had the usage of 'we' with a frequency of 20 instances. From this number, only one was an exclusive-we (specific groups, here medical students) (5%), but the rest (95%) were inclusive-we pertaining to all human beings. This can be explained by remembering that texts of this level merely resemble the features of the original reading texts. As such, use of exclusive-we which shows the writer's reference to specific groups of people (I and they) and means the writer is connecting the content to herself and others is not common in the texts of this level unless the original text had this usage.

The analysis showed that there were 3 functions of 'we': *interpretation, warning*, and *advising*. The most used function in texts of this level was *interpretation* (77%) with its three sub-functions of *shared world knowledge*, *shared experience*, and *explanation*, followed by *advising/suggesting* (13.6%), and *warning* (9%). Table 4.31 shows the usages, functions and frequency of each function in responses of this cognitive level accompanied with an example. Use of a concordancer showed the verbs that collocated with pronoun 'we' (for more details on the verbs collocating with 'we' and their frequency refer to Appendix K, Table K1 and for the examples of each function refer to the concordancer lines of the uses of 'we' in Appendix N).

Table 4.31

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'We' in Texts of Level 1 Cognitive Engagement

Functions	Usages of pronoun 'we'		Description	Linguistic cues	Example
	Inclusive	Exclusive			
1. Interpretation a) Shared Knowledge i-world knowledge ii-scientific knowledge b) Shared Experience c) Explanation (about/part of the reading text)	15 (68%) [4] [18%] 1 [4.5%] [8] [36.3%) [2] [9%]	2 (9%) [0] [0] [0] [2] [9%]	Making sense of reading by connecting it to one's world and general scientific knowledge, shared experience, or more elaboration	-Verbs of cognition (e.g., know) and perception (e.g., feel), and relational verbs (need, are, have) -Verbs of activity (talk, visit, travel) and perception (see) - Time clauses -Verbs of perception(feel)	a.i) "*Change is good, because we cannot learn and become what we need to be by remaining what we are.*"(PM.38.B) (inclusive) a.ii) *"Coffee as we know it is a stimulant substance that can help you make up and be more active also it may make you smarter and think clearly."* (PN.29.B) (inclusive) b) *"When we visit a new place, we actually visit culture, tradition, people and even food."* (PM.55.B) (inclusive) c) *In addition, with knowing that we*

					can determine that the placebo is very helpful for the patients. (PM.307.B) (exclusive [medical students])
2. Warning	2 (9%)	0	Cautioning of negative consequence of some situation	-Modals (have to ----, --- will---)	*"All of these things can change our mind and body in either positive or negative way, so we have to be careful in which way we will be affected."* (PM.55.B) (inclusive)
3. Advising/ suggesting	3 (13.6%)	0	Giving advice about a situation	- Modal (must) - If- clauses	*"We must eat something include Vitamin A to be more healthy."* (PN.51.C) (inclusive)
Total 22 (100%)	20 (90.9%)	2 (9%)			

The rhetorical function of *interpretation* found here is in line with Harwood's (2005) finding that one of the functions of 'we' is to persuade readers to consider the writer's arguments and interpretation. Hyland (2001, 2002) also found that one function of 'we' was to refer to shared knowledge. In this study, the *interpretation* function was seen in forms of *shared knowledge*, *shared experience* and *explanations* probably not only to persuade the readers of accuracy of their claims but also for establishing solidarity with the readers (Chang, 2014; Hyland, 2001, 2002). Functions of 'we' for *warning* and *advising/suggesting* could be said to be some ways by which the writers try to direct the readers in an argument or 'position' them (Hyland, 2002) by highlighting what is a good way for the situation at hand (advising) or what happens if something is not done with the situation (warning). These functions also could be considered as ways to tone down directives (Chang, 2014). However, it should be remembered that the texts in this level are mostly a 'retelling' of the original reading text representing its tone, ideas, and format, so whatever the writer is interpreting or advising or warning is usually the original author's and not the writer's.

Similarly, the high usage of inclusive-we here can be related to the passive role of the writers in texts of this level, just being a narrator, and not having an active role to present themselves as specific social, cultural, political, or religious groups. Pronoun 'we' was also used with modal verbs of 'must' and 'have to' which express 'obligation and necessity'. In order to avoid creating too many categories, these uses of 'we' were categorised under the function of *advising and suggesting*, knowing that they are stance markers (Hyland, 2002) that show obligation to doing something, which is best to be done and not neglected, especially in the contexts that these words were used in the data (see the example in the table above). The other

side of *advising* was the use of ‘we’ to function as *warning*; if something advised is not done there would be negative consequences.

To sum up, we could say that the role of the writer by using ‘we’ as all people in this level is deprived of the authorial force. It is an empty ‘we’, because it seems the writer chose it as it was a feature of the original texts.

Pronoun ‘we’ in texts of level 2 cognition. There was a total number of 88 uses of pronoun ‘we’ in the texts of this cognitive level. Like in the texts of level 1, there were both usages of inclusive and exclusive-we, and the use of inclusive-we outnumbered (69=78.4%) that of exclusive (19=21.5%). However, the increase in the use of exclusive-we can indicate that it was used to show how the writers positioned themselves in the texts (Kuo, 1999). The semantic referents of exclusive-we (I and they) were different social and cultural groups: Muslims (3 instances), medical professionals (3), readers of the reading text (5), and students (1). As Kuo (1999) asserts, use of ’we’ produces a sense of camaraderie since the reader has been invited to share experience and knowledge with others. It can be true for both usages of ‘we’. The analysis also showed that the number of functions of ‘we’ increased from three found in level 1 texts to six. Beside the functions of *interpretation* (45.4%), *advising/suggesting* (33.9%), and *warning* (2.27%), there were 3 new functions of ‘we’: *prediction* (10.22%), *enquiring* (1.13%), and *ability* (6.8%) (for more details on the verbs collocating with ‘we’ and their frequencies refer to Appendix K, Table K2 and for more examples refer to the concordancer lines of the uses of ‘we’ in Appendix N).Table 4.32 shows the usages, functions and frequency of each function with an example. An important finding in texts of this level is that from the 88 total usages of ‘we’, 47 were for the function of *interpretation* (53.4%).This is consistent with the feature of texts in this level since they show an interpretation of the reading texts. It seems that students preferred to rely on this function more to show their interpretations of the texts than most other functions.

Table 4.32

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'We' in Texts of Level 2 Cognitive Engagement

Functions	Usages of pronoun 'we'		Description	Linguistic cues	Example
	Inclusive	Exclusive			
1. Interpretation a) Shared knowledge i-world knowledge	31 (35.2%) [7] [7.9%]	16 (18.1%) [0]	Making sense of reading by connecting it to specific or collective "we" 's world or general	-Verbs of perception (e.g., hear), activity (e.g., learn, stop)	a. i) *"In the past <u>we</u> [medical professionals] <u>used to treat the patients</u> physically ignoring any other possible factors, <u>we can [could] cure his wounds or illness</u> but the main source hasn't been taken in consideration."* (PM.12.A)(exclusive)
ii-scientific knowledge	[7] [7.9%]	[5] [5.6%]	scientific knowledge, shared experience, or presenting more elaboration	-Verbs of cognition (grasp, know, notice) and relational verbs (are, have, had)	a. ii) *"Human brain can be fooled easily once <u>we believe</u> in a state, our bodies react accordingly . For example placebo effect…."*(PM. 43.B) (inclusive)
b) Shared Experience	[14] [15.9%]	[3] [3.4%]			b) *"The respect is the values that <u>we born on</u> it or in other word it is our believe in some things like the author said."* (PN.59.A) (inclusive)
c) Explanation (about/part of the reading text)	[3] [3.4%]	[8] [9%]			c) *"When <u>we take</u> Dax's situation from an Islamic perspective, <u>we could readily say</u> that Muslim doctors would consider this as a forlorn hope for the patient."* (PM.37.A) (exclusive [Muslim medical professionals])
2. Warning	5 (5.6%)	0	Cautioning of negative consequence of some action/ situation	- Conjunction (if) - Modals (have to, will)	*"<u>If</u> <u>we let</u> our problem continue and we didn't stop to manage it, it <u>will</u> destroy our whole life."* (PN.32.D) (inclusive)
3. Advising/ suggesting	17 (19.3%)	1 (1.1%)	Giving advice or suggestion for a situation	Modals (e.g., should, have to, need)	*"The article seems to indicate that it only works on recent brain injuries. In the other hand, it would be quite interesting if <u>we</u> [in the medical field] <u>can apply</u> this gel into other damaged parts of the body, since… ."* (PM.1.A) (exclusive [medical professionals])
4. Prediction	11 (12.5%)	0	Foretelling of a state or action usually in a positive sense	-Conditional sentences (true and hypothetical) -Time clauses	*"If we do exercise <u>we will</u> eat healthy food and <u>we will</u> have a good body and good shape."* (PN.59.D)(inclusive)

5. Enquiring (indirect)	0	1 (1.1%)	Questioning and wondering	Modal (can) Wh-clauses	*"I don't know how can we found a new solution for treatment of obese people,…."* (PM.29.B) (exclusive [medical professionals)
6. Ability	5 (4.5%)	1 (1.1%)	Being able to have or do something	-Modals (e.g., can)	"The *story holds many clear and beautiful meaning we can see them between the lines and the words of it. Although it's small, but it contains a lot of judgment and morality*." (PN.36.C) (exclusive [readers])
Total 88(100%)	69 (78.4%)	19 (21.5%)			

The contexts that showed the use of 'we' for *interpretation* seemed to be different too. They used *shared knowledge*, whether the general/world or scientific knowledge, *shared experiences,* and cognitive reasoning for *explanation* to show and present their interpretation, something that Harwood (2005) described as elaborating of an argument. *Shared knowledge* refers to something that is recognised, familiar, and accepted by both readers and writers (Hyland, 2005). Both Hyland (2005) and Kuo (1999) found this use of 'we' in their studies. A distinction was made here between *shared world knowledge* and *shared experience*. The former relates to the facts, ideas, or beliefs known to most people (general knowledge), while the latter refers to concrete situational experiences that most people have had. Kuo (1999) found that one discourse function of 'we' is to justify a proposition by explanation. We can see here that the writers tried to appeal to the reasoning or interpretational ability of the readers to justify what they are proposing or what they understood from the reading text.

They also used 'we' to present their propositions in forms of other functions (*warning*, *advising/suggesting*, *predicting* etc.) in a more general tone to keep it relevant to all audiences. This is consistent with Harwood's finding that "inclusive-we was used to 'describe propositions' and hypotheses that writer expects the community to endorse" [emphasis in original] (Harwood, 2005, p. 355). Chang (2014) found students in her study used 'we' in their argumentative essays to perform the following functions: establishing solidarity, toning down directives, presenting a general claim, and as a meta-discourse device.

As mentioned earlier, the nature of the writing assignment has a great influence on the usage of personal pronouns (writer-reader visibility and the level of engagement with the readers). When students write research papers, they need to present scientific evidence to back

up their claims instead of personal convictions (McCrostie, 2008). But in the reader response assignment, which is based on writers' opinions, there is less urgency and pressure to use textual scientific evidence; therefore, use of shared knowledge of the world and science seems to be a strategy that students use to understand the content of the reading texts. As a result, use of the first person pronouns is very helpful and increases the writers' visibility in the texts. Another reason for the use of pronoun 'we' in student responses might have been that they wanted to make their writing more objective. It has been found that lecturers use this pronoun more than pronoun 'I' in their presentations to make it more objective and as a result, protect themselves from the questions and opinions of their colleagues by using a 'collective-we' (e.g., Zhang, 2012). Similarly, Fortanet uses the terms 'royal we' to explain the reason for the usage of this pronoun rather than 'I' by the writers. Use of 'we' as a hedging device has also been identified. It has been stated that this pronoun, whether inclusive or exclusive, can act as a hedging device by which the speakers and writers try to protect themselves from questioning and opinions of their discourse community members (Fortanet, 2004; Hyland, 2002; Shehzad, 2007). Harwood (2005) mentions another reason for the writers' use of inclusive-we as a hedging device, which is to direct the readers to their arguments and interpretations. Others believe that as a hedging device it can tone down the force of writer's directives (e.g., Chang, 2014).

Like in Harwood's study (2005), students in this study used inclusive-we to pose questions that they planned to answer later, thus arousing the reader interest. Hyland (2001) considers questions as linguistic devices that have not been adequately examined in the literature. Swales (1990) in his discussion of genre analysis considers questions as devices to 'establish a niche', in the introductions of research articles. Questions can be in both direct and indirect forms. In Hyland's study (2001) he found only 8.5% usage of questioning and explained that writers might start a text by a question to draw the readers and arouse their interest in the topic. He believes that using questions at the beginning is a rhetorical device because the writers themselves answer them, but most questions are usually at the closing of paper as to keep the readers' curiosity aroused for further research. He found that 80% of questions in his study were rhetorical and solely used in academic papers of soft disciplines. In my study, however, no direct questions were seen at the beginning or end of the student responses; only one indirect question was used in the middle of the text. This might be that the genre of the reader response is different from the research articles and the writers do not feel that they have to raise the reader's interest

but to use the questions for establishing their argument, more or less the process of 'establishing a niche'.

There has been an increase in the use of modal verbs (36.3%), which shows more writer's attitude towards the proposition by using them for the functions of *interpretation, advising/suggesting*, *ability* and for engaging the reader too (Hyland, 2001, 2005). In English, modals denote specific mood and indicate a mode of necessity or possibility in a proposition (Martine, 2011). Ivanič and Camps (2001) relate the use of modality as an aspect of interpersonal positioning of the writers, displaying their degree of self-assurance and certainty.
Considering the feature of text of this level, we could say that the role of writer by the use of pronoun 'we', therefore, is that of *interpreter* and *translator*, the same as the role of 'I' in texts of level 2 as explained earlier.

Pronoun 'we' in texts of level 3 cognition. In the texts of this level, again we see both usages of inclusive (100= 58.5%) and exclusive- we (76=41.4%). However, the difference in the frequency of exclusive-we in this level and those in levels 1 and 2 is huge. While in level 1 there was only 9% usage of exclusive-we and in level 2 21.5%, in level 3 this usage was 41.4%.
The exclusive-we was used to refer to specific social, cultural, religious, and racial groups of people (see Table 4.33).

Table 4.33

Referents of Exclusive We in Texts of Level 3 Cognitive Engagement

Referents of exclusive-we	Saudis	Muslims	I & they (friends/family members)	Medical students	Children	Readers of the reading text	All students	Lovers	Customers	Arabs
No. and % Total 76	15 (19.7 %)	6 (7.8 %)	6 (7.8%)	6 (7.8%)	1 (1.3 %)	9 (11.8%)	22 (28.9 %)	3 (3.9 %)	5 (6.5 %)	3 (3.9 %)

As is the feature of texts of this level, we see the connection the students made between the content by drawing from their own life, their own personal experiences, their nation (Saudis), race (Arabs), religion (Muslims), or to their social role (e.g., being children [daughters]). This is what Tang and John (1999) also found in their study in which students used 'we' instead of 'I' to show themselves as representative of a group of people.

About the use of exclusive-we, Thonney (2013) found that while expert writers use 'we' to show their expertise and membership to their discipline, student writers usually do not use 'we' in this sense since they do not want to be considered as presenting themselves as equal to the experts. Therefore, students in her study used 'we' in its inclusive sense to make it more relevant to a general audience and not only to the instructor. Okamura (2011) has a similar finding in her analysis of lecturers' speech and asserts that the exclusive-we can show instructor's authority (teachers and others in the field), and inclusive-we can show relationship of teacher and student. Probably that is why in her study the use of 'we' was twice as much as that of 'I'. In my study, however, it seems students used the first person pronouns for different purposes. In general, they used inclusive-we more than exclusive-we but in texts of this cognitive level, the high usage of exclusive-we can indicate that they were not hesitant to show their authority in the subject by connecting the content to specific groups of people and presenting their argument using this type of usage. So it seems to some extent, the finding on the use of exclusive-we in texts of this level of cognition is different from that of Thonney's. Another difference of texts here with those in levels 1 and 2 is the number of functions of 'we'. From the six functions of 'we' found in level 2, the function of *enquiring* was not seen in this data; however, two more functions were found: *criticising* and *wishing*. Again, the most frequently used function was *interpretation* (62.4%) followed by *advising/ suggestion* (17.5%), *prediction* (6.7%), *ability* (6.2%), *criticising* (3.9%), *warning* (1.6%), and *wishing* (1.1%).

Table 4.34 summarises the findings (for more details on the verbs collocating with 'we' and their percentages refer to Appendix K, Table K3 and for the examples of each function refer to the concordancer lines of the uses and rhetorical function of 'we' in Appendix N).

Table 4.34

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'We' in Texts of Level 3 Cognitive Engagement

Functions	Usages of pronoun 'we'		Description	Linguistic cues	Example
	Inclusive	Exclusive			
1. Interpretation a) Shared knowledge i-world knowledge	57 (32.3 %) [27] *[15.3 %]*	53 (30.1 %) [0]	Making sense of reading by connecting it to specific or collective "we" 's world or general scientific	- Modals (have to, may) - Relational verbs (are, have, look, need), verbs of cognition (think, believe, like), perception (feel,	a.i) "*We are in living in an era where the most useful and healthy food and fodder could be the main reason for fatal diseases*."(PM.3.B)*(inclusive)* *a.ii) "HPVs are common*

ii-scientific knowledge b) Shared Experience c) Explanation (about/part of the reading text)	[18] *[10.2 %]* [8] *[4.5 %]* [4] *[2.2 %]*	[3] *[1.7 %]* [39] *[22.1 %]* [11] *[6.2 %]*	knowledge, shared experience, or presenting more elaboration	see, perceive), and activity(talk, take, get, tell) - Time clauses (when) - Relational verbs (are, have), verbs of cognition (understand, consider, remember), perception (hear, see), and activity(lead, bought) - Modals (may, can, would, used to) - Conjunctions (because, so, but) - Relational verbs (have, are)	*infection; however, and since we, in Saudi Arabia and Islamic world have that one-partner rule we have it less than the western countries."* (PM.11.C) (exclusive [Saudis]) b)*"American restaurants try to make you satisfied with their high prices by saying that you may refill as much as you want, we might think that is economic, and we try to take advantage and drink and eat much more than what our bodies need!"* (PM.11.B) (exclusive [consumers]) c) "*So this story teaches us how we control our emotions in the right way while we are angry without injuring others*." (PN.36.D) (exclusive [readers])
2. Warning	2 *(1.1 %)*	1 *(0.5 %)*	Cautioning of negative consequence of a situation/action	- If-clause ([negative verb)----will])	*"Instead, we should encourage women to get pregnant. If we don't do that, the population will decrease and that lead to lessen the labor force."* (PM.20.A) (exclusive [Saudi medical students)
3. Advising/ suggesting	15 *(8.5 %)*	16 *(9%)*	Giving advice or suggestion for a situation	Modals (should, must, shouldn't, have to, can)	*"Instead, we should encourage women to get pregnant. If we don't do that, the population [in Saudi Arabia] will decrease and that lead to lessen the labor force."* (PM.20.A) (exclusive [Saudi medical students)
4. Prediction	8 *(4.5 %)*	4 *(2.2 %)*	Foretelling of a situation	- True conditional sentences (if-----, will/will not)	*"Fewer amounts of home work will be great, to be a better students and increase our outcome on the exams because we will have more time to study. We will be happier and optimistic."* (PN.37.C) (exclusive [students])
5. Ability	11 *(6.2 %)*	0	Being able to have or do something	Modals (can, could, might)	*"I believe that we can trick our mind to believe the things we want. Even if we are stressed, we can pretend that we are not."* (PM.19.B) (exclusive [Muslims])

6. Criticising	7 *(3.9 %)*	0	Finding faults with state of something	- Quantifiers and adverbs(all, never, just, unfortunately) - Conjunction (but) - Wh-questions (why, where)	*"Orphans are kids that didn't choose this direction of life, so why do we don't treat them or take care of them like we take care of our own children."* (PM.7.C) (inclusive)
7. Wishing	0	2 *(1.1 %)*	Hoping for a state or action	Adverbs (hopefully) Modal (will)	*"What I really hope that people become more aware about organic food and that we have more organic food stores in Saudi Arabia to get it easily."* (PM.56.B) (exclusive [Saudis])
Total 176(100%)	100 (58.5 %)	76 (41.4 %)			

As is the feature of texts in this level of cognition, it is expected to see more functions of first person pronouns. When we consider Ivanič and Camps's (2001) language meta functions, especially the 'interpersonal positioning', we will notice that one of the linguistic devices that writers use to show different degrees of self-assurance and certainty and different power relationships between the writer and readers is the use of first person pronouns (Hrisonopulo, 2007). Additionally, Hyland (2002) found that student writers use first person pronouns to do different functions, among which is 'elaborating an argument'. In the reader responses that show more cognitive involvement of the writers, it can be said that the writers are not retelling or interpreting the content but are trying to have 'an influence on readers and persuade them' (Hyland, 2002) by forming a bond between themselves and the readers through connecting the content and their argument to all readers (inclusive-we) or to specific groups of people (e.g., Arabs, students etc.). Therefore, the interpersonal positioning aspect of the writer in texts of this cognitive level is more highlighted and so is the use of different functions of personal pronoun. Kuo (1999) found that the use of inclusive-we referring to the writer and readers was more seen in assuming shared knowledge, goals, perspective and also it suggested a truism about the writer's statement. This is what we see in the texts at this level, sharing world and scientific knowledge and experiences (32.3%). Also Kuo found that writers use 'we' to give a reason or discuss necessity and to express wishes or expectation (p.130). These functions too were seen in texts of this level in forms of *warning*, *perdition*, *advice/suggestion*, and *wishing*. A new function found here was *criticising (3.9%)*. Harwood (2005) too found this function of inclusive-we in his

study and stated that it was used by writers as a politeness strategy to minimise the face-threatening act (FTA) for the discipline and the discourse community and to present the unsatisfactory state of affairs or practices as a shared responsibility.

A point worth mentioning is that while the model of cognitive levels of engagement indicates relating the content to self and others as evidence of higher level of cognitive involvement, Chang (2014) has a somewhat different finding in her study. She found that in general the less proficient students used personal pronouns more than the more proficient groups and they used 'I' more while the other groups used 'we' more. She hypothesised that this might have been partially due to the lack of knowledge on finding sources resulting in students' of lesser proficiency resorting to the use of personal experiences for their arguments. However, considering her observation, the more proficient groups used 'we' for sharing experiences and knowledge, which can be said to be align with our cognitive model here.

Again, we see a high usage of modal verbs (30.6%) in texts of this level showing stance of the writer in the form of a collective we (inclusive-we) toward a state or situation in order to establish solidarity or toning down a directive (Chang, 2014; Hyland, 2001, 2005; Martin, 2011). In Chang's study (2014), students used 'we' together with obligatory modal verbs (should, must, need to…) to soften an order/command, to underline having a responsibility, or to promote a certain view. She believes that since obligation models are accompanied by 'we', they tone down the authorial tone of the writer towards the reader and bring the reader and writer closer together. The finding here is different from Martin's (2011) study on Filipino students' reflection essays which showed lack of modals of obligation ability and certainty accompanying 'we'. However, use of modals of necessity and obligation with 'we' in this study was mainly to show some functions of inclusive-we (e.g., *warning*, *criticising*).

The role of the writer in the texts of this level seems to be that of *representative*, a person using 'we' to speak on behalf of others, whether this 'we' is a specific group or people in general (Tang & John, 1999).

Pronoun 'we' in texts of level 4 cognition. There were eight texts in this level which had uses of pronoun 'we' with a total of 39 instances. The analysis showed that the use of inclusive-we was 21 instances (53.8%) and the exclusive-we was 18 (46.1%). The use of exclusive-we referred to the following specific groups of people: Muslim women (7 instances), children (7), and Saudis (8). This finding is interesting since it is the only cognitive level in the data in which

the use of exclusive-we has dominancy. Almost all studies mentioned so far, which examined the usages of inclusive and exclusive 'we', found the use of inclusive-we to supersede that of exclusive (e.g., Fortanet, 2004; Harwood, 2005; Hyland, 2001; Kuo, 1999; Thonney, 2013; Yeo & Ting, 2014). Only in Shehzad's study (2007), which examined the academic papers in hard sciences (computer sciences), the use of exclusive-we was found to be more than inclusive apparently due to the writers' need to be explicit and clear on their ideas and prepositions. The dominancy of exclusive-we in texts of this cognitive level, however, can be explained by the criteria for texts of this level which is prescriptive judgment and seeing the bigger picture. The students apparently connected the reading texts to their own society and the specific issues that it is grappling with and used exclusive-we to address the issues and call for action from the members of their own society.

The total number of functions of 'we' found in the texts was four: *interpretation* (41%), *advising/suggesting* (25.5%), *prediction* (10.2%), and *criticising* (23%). The following table (Table 4.35) shows the usages and functions of pronoun 'we' with their frequencies.

Table 4.35

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'We' in Texts of Level 4 Cognitive Engagement

Functions	Usages of pronoun 'we'		Description	Linguistic cues	Example
	Inclusive	Exclusive			
1. Interpretation a) Shared knowledge i-world knowledge b) Shared Experience c) Explanation (about/part of the reading text)	2 (5.1 %) [1] [2.5 %] 0 [1] [2.5 %]	8 (20.5 %) [1] [2.5 %] [7] [17.9 %] [0]	Making sense of reading by connecting it to specific or collective we's world knowledge, shared experience, or more elaboration	Verbs of activity (talk, finish) Verbs of activity (cover, stay, protect,..) and relational verbs (have, don't have) Conjunction (because)	*a. i) "No matter how long we talk about mothers we will never finish."* (PM.59.E) (inclusive) b) *"We, Muslim women, cover our hair so men won't see our beauty."* (PM.60.D) (exclusive [Muslim women]) c) *"Eventually, if we stick to our point of view and spread the right criteria of beauty, the society will change because we changed. Then these nonsense* [fake measures of beauty] *criteria will change and people will not face a rejection from their own society, because we are the society."* (PM.2.A)(inclusive)
2. Advising/ suggesting	3 (7.6 %)	7 (17.9 %)	Advice or suggestion for a situation	Modals of obligation and advice (should, have to)	*"We should also know the sources of vitamin D such as the exposure to the sun. In addition, some kind of food contain vitamin D, so we*

					should try to eat more from these kind of food." (PM.52.C) (inclusive)
3.Prediction	5 (12.8%)	0	Foretelling of a state or action	-If-clauses,…will	*"Eventually, if we stick to our point of view and spread the right criteria of beauty, the society will change because we changed. "(PM.2.A) (inclusive)*
4. Criticising	11 (28.2%)	3 (7.6%)	Finding faults with state of something	Questions (wh-q, yes/no q.) -Activity verbs (throw, get rid of, take back…)	*" Islam is the religion god choose for us. …….. Most women are impressed by the western culture…. But they don't look at the dark side. . . We are no men so how can we demand we have the same rights... ."* (PM.60.D) (exclusive [Muslim women])
Total 39 (100%)	21 (53.8%)	18 (46.1%)			

Unlike the texts of other cognitive levels which showed high usages of *interpretation* function, here this function comprised only 25.6% of the total instances. On the other hand, the functions of *criticising* (35.8%) had the highest occurrence followed by *advising/suggesting* (25.5%), and *prediction* (12.8%). It should be remembered that these functions seemed to contribute to the prominent features of the texts of this level. That is, the texts of this level show the writers' attempt at connecting the reading content to other related issues, seeing the negative aspects (predicting) and usually challenging a situation (criticising), and asking for an action (advising) that is beneficial for the case. Harwood (2005) believes that communal pronouns can act as negative politeness when the writers want to criticise the practices of their discourse community or a specific group of people they are a member of, something that is well-illustrated in the student text in the above table for this function. Hyland (2001) also found that sometimes, use of inclusive 'we' reduces the writer's discipline together with its participants down to a homogenous entity in order to critique it. After criticising, the writer usually describes an alternative idea or method that would benefit the discipline better (call for action). So he explains that use of inclusive-we to pinpoint a shortcoming of the discipline facilitates the writer's effort in urging the community to take his idea and solution to advance the discipline. By using 'communal we', the writer shows a collective lack of knowledge or a hoped-for state. It should be noted that except for one, all the texts in this cognitive level belonged to the pre-med group

whose language proficiency level is generally higher than that of pre-nursing group (explained in an earlier chapter).

Overall, besides the finite verbs modal verbs (should, have to) comprised 17.9% of all verbs (see Appendix K, Table K4 for details and for the examples of different rhetorical functions of 'we' refer to the concordancer lines of the use of 'we' in Appendix N). These modals show advice and obligation (Azar & Hagen, 2011), the main features of texts in this level. Like the texts in level 3, we see the writer's stance and authorial self in this data and use of these two modal verbs to help to create an interpersonal positioning (Hyland, 2001; Ivanič & Camps, 2001; Lopez, 2012) and making an argument (Hyland, 2012).

As writers in texts of this level have a critical view of the issues raised in the reading texts and argue and suggest a set of actions for the members of their society and authorities, it can be said that the role of the writer here is that of a *critic* and a *promoter*.

Summary of the uses and functions of 'we' in texts of different cognitive levels. To have a comparative view of uses and functions of 'we' in texts of different cognitive levels, a summary table was created (Table M2, Appendix M). Overall, from all 325 instances of 'we', 206 (63.3%) were used as inclusive-we, a finding that is similar to those of some other studies where 'we' for people had the highest frequency (Fortanet, 2004; Harwood, 2005; Kuo, 1999; Shehzad, 2007; Thonney, 2013; Yeo & Ting, 2013). From the total number of 'we' found in texts of all cognitive levels, the highest frequency of 'we' and its functions were seen in texts of level 3 (54.1%), which by its feature is expected to have the most frequency of personal pronouns. The least functions and frequencies of 'we' were, however, seen in texts of level 1 (6.7%). Texts of levels 2 (27%) and 4 (12%) had the most frequency after texts of level 1 respectively. Also the highest frequency of exclusive-we was seen in texts of levels 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively. This finding is related to that of Tang and John (1999) on student essays. From the 6 genre roles that they examined in the essays, the genre role of 'we' as 'representative of a specific group of people or people in general' comprised a big portion of the roles for this pronoun. They considered this role of 'we' to be the least 'powerful' among the others.

As for the rhetorical functions, there were 8 functions found for 'we' in the data. However, while texts of levels 1 and 4 had the least number of functions (3 and 4 respectively), texts of levels 3 and 2 had the most (7 and 6). This is expected as the features of cognitive levels 2 and 3 have more writer presence either for interpretation or for self and others' engagement

(*warning*, *predication*, *advising*/*suggestion*…). Texts of level 4, although expected to have more usage of 'we' and therefore more functions of it, did not show this, probably because of the small sample size. The most used functions of 'we' across all cognitive levels were *interpretation* and *advising/suggesting*. The least used ones were *enquiring* (1 case) and *wishing* (4 cases). *Warning* and *prediction* were seen in texts of three levels while *ability* and *criticising* were seen in texts of two levels. It was shown that the use of different rhetorical functions generally helped in creating the features of the texts in each cognitive level.

Students in this study also used 'we' with modal verbs, especially modals of obligation, to tone down their directive too. This had the effect of softening the tone of an order and command, having a responsibility, or promoting a certain view. Since obligation modals were accompanied by 'we', this seemed to, as Chang (2014) argues, modulate the authorial tone of the writer from the reader's viewpoint and bring the reader and writer closer together. As for the use of 'we' to present a general claim, it was found that students used this pronoun to rely on common grounds and shared experiences, values, knowledge, and traditions to voice their opinions or present their arguments. As in Chang's study, these types of generalisations were sometimes preceded by phrases such as as we all know or we know that clauses. By presenting facts and general truths, students tried to lead to and then support their arguments (e.g., "*as Muslim women, we should*……."). The only function of 'we' that was seen in Chang's study but not in this study was the use of 'we' as a meta-discourse device. This was probably because the genre of reader response is not similar to that of essays that would need structuring and setting outlines.

Now we turn to the use of last personal pronoun (you) in texts of different cognitive levels.

4.3.4 Uses and functions of the second person pronoun.

In this study, 'you' was the least used pronoun (21.20%) among the three. The present study being focussed on reader response genre and being in a written mode, only uses of you-general and you-audience would be therefore applicable (refer to the segment on 'you' in Section 6 of the Literature Review Chapter). In the following, usages and functions of pronoun 'you' in texts of different cognitive levels are further described.

Pronoun 'you' in texts of level 1 cognition. Analysis of the texts in this cognitive level showed that from the total of 28 student texts, 10 had uses of 'you' with a frequency of 51 instances. 'You' was used in its two major usages: personal (you-audience) and impersonal (you-

general) (refer to Table 4.36 for the frequency, functions and examples). Analysis also showed that the usage of you-audience (60.6%) was more than that of you-general (39.2%). There were overall six functions of 'you' identified in these texts, three of which were solely used as you-audience: *instructions*, *explanation* (of the instructions) and *advising/suggesting*. From the other three, *prediction* and *definition* functions had the usage of you-general while the function of *interpretation* had both usages of 'you'. The *interpretation* function had one main sub-function: *shared world and scientific knowledge*.

Table 4.36

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'You' in Texts of Level 1 Cognitive Engagement

Functions	Usages of 'you'		Description	Linguistic cues	Example
	You-audience	You-general			
1. Instructions	12 (23.5%)	0	Ordering certain course of action	- Transitional words of order (first, second, then), - Time phrase /clause (when, after) - Conditionals - Imperatives	*"Then warm up very fastly like you are in the race for one hour."*(PN.39.D) (you–audience)
2. Explaining the instructions	6 (11.7%)	0	Elaborating on the order	- Modals (have to, may, need to) - Conjunction (because, so) - Infinitives for purpose	*"For longer race you need more energy so trying to warm your body more."* (PN.39.D) (you–audience)
3. Advising/ Suggesting	8 (15.6%)	0	Advising and suggesting an option	- Modals (may, can, cannot, should, have to) - Time clauses (when------, ---can---)	*"Asking about the things that help other people to be creative may help you to be one. You may try different methods that they use and it may help you."* (PM.19.D) (you–audience)
4. Prediction	0	2 (3.9%)	Foretelling the consequence of a situation	- Conditionals	*"So you will spend more and cause you broken if you don't have money to pay."* (PN.39.E) (you–general)
5. Definition	0	1 (1.9%)	Defining an idea, concept	- Use of relative pronouns with a descriptive clause (whom)	"*Friends is someone with whom you are comfortable. Friends share your joy, secrets, and pain.*"(PN.7.E) (you–general)

6. Interpretation a) shared world knowledge and scientific truths	5 (9.8%)	17 (33.3%)	Making sense of a point/idea by relating it to one's prior knowledge', the sense of 'we' as knowers of general or scientific facts)	- Conjunctions (so, because) - Modals (can,) - Noun clauses (what…) - The more---, the –er) constructs	*"In a second paragraph, he said that acne occurs when there is overproduction of oil which makes sense because when you touch acne you feel a little oil in your finger."* (PM.20.E) (you–general)
Total 51 (100%)	31 (60.6%)	20 (39.2%)			

Being in level 1 cognition, this heavy reliance on the use of you-audience might seem perplexing but this can be explained by a) knowing that in this level, students merely copy the ideas by narrating or paraphrasing the author's ideas, and b) their argument (body of the text) is usually affected by the genre of the original reading texts.

Overall, the functions of 'you' found in the texts of this level are consistent with what Yeo and Ting (2014) identified. They found that lecturers used you-audience to 'activate audience's prior knowledge', 'give instructions', 'make announcements', 'share personal experiences', and 'direct students' attention', while they used you-general for 'explaining their subject matter'. In this study, the use of you-audience was mostly for *instructing* the audience (23.5%), *explaining the instruction* (11.7%), and based on writers' (in fact author's) own experiences giving *advice/suggestion* (15.6%), whereas use of you-general was mainly for *prediction* (3.9%), *defining* (1.9%), and also for *interpretational purposes,* by using shared world and scientific knowledge (33.3%).

The difference between Yeo and Ting's findings and this study is that in the former you-audience was used for activating audiences' prior shared knowledge, while in the latter, students used you-general to present shared world and scientific knowledge to assist them in presenting their interpretation of a topic.

Regarding the verbs collocating with 'you', it was found that from the 4 verb tenses used in the texts, most were in the simple present (62.7%). Modals (can, may, have to, should) comprised about 25.4% of the verbs (for more details on the frequency and percentages of verbs collocating with 'you' refer to Appendix L, Table L1 and for examples of each function refer to the concordancer lines of the uses of 'you' in Appendix N).

So, overall due to copying the tone and genre of the original reading texts in this cognitive level, the most used function is *interpretation* (43.1%).

Pronoun 'you' in texts of level 2 cognition. Texts of this level of cognition show both personal and impersonal usages of 'you'. The use of impersonal or you-general, however, had dominancy by comprising 61.3% of all instances. The analysis showed that from the six functions identified in texts of this level, four had only one usage of 'you', that of you-general: *predicting* (7.9%), *indirect question* (2.9%), *definition* (1.9%), and *enquiring* (0.9%). The other two functions, *advising/suggesting* and *interpretation,* had both usages of 'you'. For the *interpretational* function, students used you-general to *share world and scientific knowledge* (31.6%), to refer to *shared experience* (18.7%) and to present the *moral of the story* (2.9%). There was no function of *instructing* or *explaining the instruction* in texts of this level. However, students used function of *enquiring* by which they would ask direct questions and also used *indirect questions* (1.9%) function to present their questions (for examples of each function, refer to the concordancer lines of the use of 'you' in Appendix N). The usages and functions of 'you' in texts of this level are shown in the following table.

Table 4.37

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'You' in Texts of Level 2 Cognitive Engagement

Functions	Usages of 'you'		Description	Linguistic cues	Example
	You-audience	You-general			
1. Advising/ suggesting	15 (14.8 %)	12 (11.8%)	Advice or suggestion for a situation	Modals of suggestions and possibilities (should, have to, can, may) and prediction (wouldn't)	*"Actually there is no specific injection to prevent Alzheimer but you can prevent it by … ."* (PN.8D) (you-general) "*Because chocolate contain high cholesterol it can contribute to heart disease, …. .That why you should think before you grab a chocolate bar."* (PM.7.D) (you-audience)
2. Prediction	0	8 (7.9%)	Foretelling consequence of a situation	- Conditional [future meaning] (if---, --will--)	*"Social network addiction may lead to …. . It will take away your real social world from you if you started to be addicted to it."* (PM.2.B) (you-general)
3. Enquiring	0	1 (0.9%)	Questioning	Question words (what)	*"For example, when a person touches his phone that carries flu germs then rubs his eye, he'll be infected. So what can you do to prevent transforming*

					germs through your phone? First, clean …. ." (PM.5.A) (you-audience)
4. Definition	0	2 (1.9%)	Defining an idea or concept	Relative pronouns (whom, which) with a description	*"I believe that the same concept goes to breatharianism, in which you persuade your mind that food is not necessary to metabolized and your body would function well by counting on just breathing."* (PM.43.B) (you-general)
5. Interpretation a) Shared knowledge (scientific truths, world knowledge, knowledge shared by specific groups of people) b) shared experience c) moral of a story	8 (7.9%) 16 (16.8 %) 0	24 (23.7%) 2 (1.9%) 11 (13.8%)	Making sense of a point/idea with one's prior knowledge; 'you' as 'one' or 'you audience' as knowers of general scientific facts, world knowledge or knowledge related to specific groups of people; relying on shared experience, drawing a lesson from a story/situation)	- Modals (can see,..) - Words of time (when, sometimes) - Time clauses(when) - Modals of ability (can, cannot) and possibility (might)	A) *"Watches are one kind of accessories which are suitable for all ages and gander. You can find a lot of style for your requirements such as daily life, sport, and formal occasions."* (PN.8.A) (you-audience) b) *"Sometimes you visit a country for first time and you do not know anything about their culture so you can do things are very common or normal in your society but in their society they might consider them mean and impolite behavior."* (PM.16.E) (you-audience) c) *"What was amazing about this story is the end. It showed when you really put your heart in something, you'll have it eventually."* (PM.47.C) (you-general)
6. Indirect question	0	3 (2.9%)	To present a question	- Wh-q clauses as objects of the sentence	*"The special part I was interested about how do you know if you drink enough water or not, it is a simple way to know."* (PM.31.A) (you-general)
Total 101 (100%)	39 (38.6 %)	62 (61.3%)			

As mentioned earlier, the use of you-general outnumbered that of you-audience, and the function of *interpretation* had the most frequency (60.3%) among all functions. It was expected to see the use of interpretational functions of 'you' have such prominence as it is the main feature of writing in this cognitive level. An interesting finding was that in responses to a literary

work, usually a short story, students used you-general to draw a conclusion and present their interpretation of the reading in the form of general truth or the moral of the story. Use of 'you' in contexts of *shared world and scientific knowledge*, *shared experiences* and *moral of a story* was a strategy that the students used for interpretation and explanation of a subject matter. They could therefore, be referred to general truth that most people agree on (see the related examples in the above table). Use of you-general for this purpose is consistent with what many researchers found, which is generic you presents a general truth or opinion (e.g., De Hoop & Hogeweg, 2014; Yeo & Ting, 2014). This function of impersonal you was also seen in impersonal usages of first person pronouns. Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990), for example, assert that 'I', 'you', and 'we' can be used as impersonal pronouns when the sentence is about general truths. In such sentences, these pronouns can be replaced by 'one'. Similarly, Chang (2014) asserts that it can be used for making generalisation and for truism. In fact, one of the three functions of impersonal you that she found in her study was the function of presenting morals or truism. She explains that the use of the impersonal you, makes the general statement more acceptable and understood. In the same vein, Hrisonopulo (2007) argues that 'you' when used in its generic non-referential usage can be used in utterance of judgment and generalisation (p. 247), like what we see in these texts in the moral of a story whereby the writers make a generalisation.

Regarding the verbs used in texts of this level, in addition to those tenses seen in texts of level 1 the simple past tense was also seen. Once again, most verbs were in the simple present tense (58.4%), followed by the use of different modal verbs (26.7%). The variety of modal verbs was due to the functions of *advising/suggestion*, and *interpretation* (for more details on the frequency and percentages of the verbs collocating with 'you' refer to Appendix L, Table L2). Now, we turn to the texts of level 3 to explore the uses and functions of 'you'.

Pronoun 'you' in texts of level 3 cognition. Texts in this level of cognitive involvement have evidence of writer's engagement with the reading topic by relating it to themselves or to specific groups of people. As expected, pronoun 'you' had the most frequency (133= 44%) in texts of this level of cognitive engagement among the other three levels. As such, analysis of the texts in this level showed a variety of functions for pronoun 'you'.

Like in texts of levels 1 and 2, 'you' was used both in its personal (33.8%) and impersonal (66.1%) usages. There was also one important difference in the feature of these texts that distinguished them from the texts of other levels. There was a high rise in the number of

functions in these usages making the total functions of 'you' to nine. The you-audience usage was solely seen in functions of *enquiring* (0.7%), *warning* (3%), *instructing* and *hypothetical* (each 3.7%). Functions of *advising/suggesting, prediction* and *interpretation* had both usages of 'you'. Additional functions of *hypothetical* (3.7%), *warning* (3%), and *referring to others* (4.5%) were also found in texts of this level where usage of you-audience was the only usage in *hypothetical* and *warning* and you-general in *refereeing* to others (for examples of each function, refer to the concordancer lines of the uses of 'you' in Appendix N). Since I was using only you-audience and you-general as ways to categorise the usages of 'you', I placed *referring to others* function under the you-general as it did not refer to the audience, the reader, but either to the writer as in the reported speech or to other entities (see examples of both in the table below). Table 4.38 presents the usages and functions of 'you' in this level with accompanying examples.

Table 4.38

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'You' in Texts of Level 3 Cognitive Engagement

Function	Usages of 'you'		Description	Linguistic cues	Example
	You-audience	You-general			
1. Advising/ suggesting	15 (12.2%)	2 (1.5%)	Advice or suggestions for a situation	- Modals of obligation, suggestion and possibilities (should, have to, must, can, may) - If-clauses (present time) - Infinitives as purpose	*"I think that you have to have a true friends who you can talk to them about your feelings because if you keep everything as a secret, that will affect your health."* (PN.1.A) (you-general) *"Your diet is your choice if you want a great health, you have to be aware about what you eat. You must depend on good sources such as beans, … ."* (PM.55.D) (you-audience)
2. Prediction	10 (7.5%)	12 (9%)	Foretelling the consequence of a situation	- Conditional with future time (if----, --will ---)	*"For the keeping of memories keep a memory box. You will be amazed from how much you'll remember after holding a piece of paper you wrote in class ….. !"* (PM.60.A) (you-audience)
3. Enquiring	1 (0.7%)	0	Questioning	Question words	*"First of all, do you know what the adequate water intake is?"* (PM.5.D) (you-audience)
4. Instruction	5 (3.7%)	0	Orders and a set of instructions	- Imperative verbs - Conjunction	*"For example, try to put the exact needed amount of water in front of you, so you can drink from it in every time you see it. ……. ."*

				s (so)	(PM.5.D) (you-audience)
5. Hypothetical	5 (3.7%)	0	An imagined situation	- Conditionals [hypothetical] (if------,---would---)	*"Put yourself in this condition if you are dying and there is no one that could take care of your child you would love that your child live a normal life with an adoptive parents."* (PM.7.C) (you-audience)
6. Warning	4 (3%)	0	Predicting the negative effects of some situation	- conditional [future meaning] - conjunction (because) - Modals (should,..)	*"If you are real friend, you have not leave your friends when they need a help. On the other way, you should trust in yourself because the world may a change and in one day you might be alone like in this"* (PN.17.D) (you-audience)
7. Defining	0	3 (2.2%)	Defining a concept or idea	- Adjective clauses with relative pronouns (whom)	*"*Being *a pregnant doesn't mean that you lose your skills or mental or physical abilities; pregnancy simply limits the time and effort.."* (PM.20.A) (you-general)
8. Interpretation a) Shared knowledge (scientific truths, world knowledge, knowledge shared by specific groups of people)	4 (3%)	17 (12.7 %)	Making sense of a point/idea with one's prior knowledge; 'you' as 'one' or 'you audience' as knowers of general scientific facts, world knowledge or knowledge related to specific groups of people; relying on shared	- Conditionals - Time clauses - The more-----, the more------- - Time clauses - Adverbs of time (sometimes, - Conditionals - Verbs of activity and relational verbs (are, have)	*a.1) shared scientific knowledge:" Smiling is just a simple expression; however, it has a lot of benefits that can positively affect you. Smiling has powerful and positive impacts on your mood. When you smile, your body sends signals to your brain that makes you feel happy and good. To prove this, try to smile when you're in a bad mood and see how much difference smiling makes.* (PM.14.E)(you-audience) *b.2) Shared world knowledge: "Distance learning is a great way of learning …….. . It solved a big problem, because with it you don't have to travel across seas anymore. You can get a good certificate from top universities …. ."* (PM.24.B)(you-general) *b) "Emphasizing clarity and do not bring any surprises to the reader are the most … . Moreover, people who are interested in this field come to read what you state in your thesis statement not to look for surprises and twists in the middle of the essay."* (PM.50.C) (you-general)
b) shared experience	1 (0.7%)	41 (30.8 %)	experience, extracting a lesson from a story)		
c) moral of a story	0	7 (5.2%)			

				- Time clause - Modals (may, can)	*c) "But after I read the passage, **I** learned that sometime you may need to use another language or else you will be alone in this world, and you will not succeed anything in your life*.(PM.47.E) *(you-general)*
9. Referring to others (Quotations)	0	6 (4.5%)	To show direct speech (different referents)	- Reported speech (refereeing to 'we', 'I', 'he/she')	*"…… so I went to the doctor and he checked up everything …. . so he asked me are you going through stress lately, and if you are, stop being stressed and come after one week… ."* (PM.13.E) (*you-general*: here the writer)
Total 133 (100%)	45 (33.8%)	88 (66.1%)			

As can be seen in the above table, use of 'you' for *instruction* and *enquiring* comprised 4.4% of all 'you' occurrences. Hyland (2001) asserts that the use of imperatives and questions shows the interactive nature of the texts. Writers use directives and questions as ways to engage the readers with their texts. However, he points out that while directives can orient readers towards writer's argument, they also have the connotation of unequal power relationship that is in favour of the writer's power over the reader. Use of questions, he asserts, is a good way to raise readers' interest and we can say that it is more so if they are addressed to the you-audience, as we have seen in texts of this level. The fact that the use of *instruction* decreased in texts of this level (3.7%) compared to those in level 1 (23.5%) can also be explained by what Kuo (1999) mentions as the feature of imperatives. He explains that imperative brings the focus to the action. Its feature as being command-like gives it an authoritative tone. In the journal articles, use of imperative-you might be offensive and negatively affect the writer-reader relationship as the readers are the writer's peers and have equal power, but being used in the method section lightens its tone as the focus will be on the process of investigation. Therefore, writers use it rarely and only in the methodology section. We might relate this explanation to our study here and assume that the decrease in the use of *instruction* function might be due to the students' reluctance to sound authoritative especially since the reader of their responses is the teacher who has a higher institutional status than them.

The additional functions of *hypothetical* and *warning* for you-audience are also good indicators of dialogic nature of the texts by relating the topics to the audience. Use of 'you' for

hypothetical situations has been seen in other studies as well. Okamura (2009) found that the hypothetical 'if constructs' were used more with 'you' than with 'I' and 'we' in academic lectures (e.g., If you were /are…) and the lecturers' aim by using this function of 'you' was to create a story and make the student part of it, something which was not seen in genre of public speech. Chang (2014) also found that 'you' was used as protagonist, a conversation partner, and a recipient of criticism and warnings.

Although the two functions of *hypothetical* and *warning* might have been grammatically realised by the use of if-clauses, there was a difference made in this study between the types of 'if constructs' for *hypothetical* situations and those for *warning*. For the *hypothetical* situation, there may not be a negative outcome and the context was usually about imagining a story-like situation, while in the *warning* the if construct was usually in a context of advice followed by a warning for a negative consequence if the advice was not taken seriously (refer to the examples in the above table).

As for the *interpretation* function of 'you' (in all its sub-functions of '*shared world and scientific knowledge*', '*shared experiences*' and '*moral of the story'*), which is for truism and generalisations (Chang, 2014; Hrisonopulo, 2007), the analysis showed that it comprised more than 52.6% of all 'you' usages. This is different from finding of Chang's study whereby use of 'you' for presenting morals or truism was the least used function (15.3%). She explained this might have been due to the writers' preference to use 'we' for this function instead of 'you'. She concluded that 'you' had pragmatic usage, "invoking interaction on one side and denoting imposition on the other" (p. 120). In this study however, we saw that the students used both 'we' and 'you' to present their interpretations in forms of shared experiences and shared world and scientific knowledge too. Apparently, the reader response genre gave the students more flexibility to use different personal pronouns for performing the same or different functions.

The last function of 'you' that was seen in this study was *referring to others*, where the writers used a conversational situation or sayings of famous people as a support for their propositions or just as reported speech. This function of 'you' apparently has not been addressed in the literature. In all the studies on pronoun usages and functions that I reviewed and used in this study, apparently none has addressed this function of pronoun 'you'. In Natsukari's study (2012) on the use and functions of pronoun 'I', she found use of quotations as a function of this pronoun. Some researchers (e.g., Petch-Tyson, 1998) found that use of quotations in a text was

as one of the indicators of the text having a spoken quality, highlighting the aspect of speaker or writer's 'involvement'. This might be the reason why other researchers did not find or addressed this function of 'you', especially if their studies were on academic writing. Nevertheless, the reader response genre apparently facilitated the use of this function in student writing.

Majority of the verbs used in texts of this level were in the simple present tense (56.3%) and another 21% of the verbs were modal verbs. Surprisingly, the use of modal verbs decreased in this level; however, use of some other verb tenses like simple future increased due to the use of functions of *prediction*, *warning*, *hypothesising*, and *interpretation* (for more on verbs of this level refer to Appendix L, Table L3).

The next section is about the uses and functions of 'you' in texts of cognitive level 4.

Pronoun 'you' in texts of level 4 cognition. Texts of this level, prescriptive judgment, show the association that the writers make between the reading topic and other broader issues. The frequency of 'you' was the least in this level (only 17 instances) partly due to the small sample size and partly due to the feature of texts in this category. The text analysis showed that although both usages of 'you' were seen, the use of you-general outnumbered (64.7%) that of you-audience (35.2%). Also, there were only a limited number of functions found: *advising*/suggesting (29.4%) with only you-audience usage, *interpretation* (with two sub-functions of *shared world and scientific knowledge* and *shared experience*) (64.7%) with both 'you' usages, and *referring to others* (5.8%) with you-general usage only. Table 4.39 presents the findings with related examples (for more examples of each function refer to the concordancer lines of the uses of 'you' in Appendix N).

Table 4.39

Frequency of Uses and Functions of Pronoun 'You' in Texts of Level 4 Cognitive Engagement

Function	Usages of 'you'		Description	Linguistic cues	Example
	You-audience	You-general			
1. Advising /suggesting	5 (29.4%)	0	Advice or suggestions	Modals of obligation and suggestion (have to, can)	*"When you want to teach your child a concept, you have just to find the appropriate story or make one. For example, you can teach the child how to say "Excuse me" …. ."* (PM.21.D) (you-audience)
2. Interpretation a) Shared			Making sense of a point/idea	- Relational verbs	a) *"Greed cannot be controlled. … . No matter*

knowledge (knowledge shared by specific groups of people) b) Shared experience	0 1 (5.8%)	3 (17.6%) 7 (41.1%)	with one's prior knowledge; the sense of 'you' as 'one', having shared world knowledge or knowledge related to specific groups of people; relying on shared experience)	(have), and cognition (want) - Time clauses (when)	*how wealthy you get, you will always want more. That's just human nature…*" (PM.3.D) (you-general) *b) "…. .while in Saudi Arabia the feeling of safety is what's going to fill the atmosphere around you. You sleep knowing that no one is going to break into your house and kill you."* (PM.60.D) (you-audience)
3.Referring to others	0	1 (5.8%)	In quotations	- Reported speech (different referents)	*"Muhammad, [peace be upon him] said, love for others what you love for yourself."* (PN.4.D) (you-general: here Muslims)
Total 17 (100%)	6 (35.2%)	11 (64.7%)			

An interesting finding is the role of *advising/suggesting* in texts of this level. As an expected feature of texts in this level, the writers used mostly modals of possibility to put forward their suggestions for required actions. While the percentage of usage of this function was 26.6% in level 2, and 13.7% in level 3, there was an increase in its usage in texts of this level (29.4%). Also usage of you-general was very high (64.7%), second to its usage in texts of level 2. This high reliance on you-general might emphasise the generality and truism that the writers tried to draw on by which to persuade their readers to agree with their arguments and suggested course of action. This has been observed in De Hoop and Hogeweg's study (2014) as a function of impersonal you. It also has the solidarity effect by getting the reader's involvement and agreement because of its self-ascription feature which raises the addressee's feeling of identification with or even empathy towards the writer's proposition (Scheibman, 2007, as cited in De Hoop & Hogeweg, 2014). Hyland (2001) also supports this notion and attributes the use of you-general by academic writers to their attempt to appeal to their peers in the field for persuasion and solidarity purposes.

An interesting finding with regards to the verbs collocating with 'you' in this level was that only one type of modal verb (can) was used (23.5%). Use of only this modal might be explained that the writers could tone down the force of addressing the reader by 'you' especially

if they are calling for an action. Use of modal (can) would give the meaning of a suggestion or a possibility rather than a command (for more see Appendix L, Table L4).

Summary of the uses and functions of pronoun 'you' in texts of different cognitive levels. The overall summary of the usages and functions of pronoun 'you' can be seen in Appendix M, Table M3. As the table shows, both usages of 'you' were used in all cognitive levels. In addition, the functions of *advising/suggesting* and *interpretation* were the only functions seen in texts of all cognitive levels. In fact, function of *interpretation* was the single most frequently used function of 'you' in all texts. It had the highest occurrences in text of levels 2 (64.7%), followed by levels 4 (64.5%), 3 (53.4%), and 1 (43%) respectively, with a dominancy of you-general usage. This shows that students used this pronoun, especially in its generic usage, to explain their understanding of a topic and to present it to the readers to get them involved and to 'position' them towards their own preferred way of interpretation (Hyland, 2001). Yeo and Ting (2014) examined the use of personal pronouns in lecture introductions and found that you-audience was three times more used than you-general but you-general was used for explanation and connecting with the students, the very same functions that were found in this study. They also explained that use of 'you' for sharing experiences is a technique that lecturers use to connect with their audience, which is something that could also be said about the writers of reader responses here. Students used 'you' to refer to shared knowledge and experiences in order to establish a rapport with the reader and to add more weight to their opinions.

Texts in level 4 had the least frequencies and functions of 'you' (3 functions), while texts of levels 1 and 2 had more (6 functions) and those in level 3 had the most (9 functions). In general, it seems that use of pronoun 'you' in its both forms of personal and impersonal had multiple functions which enabled students to interact with their audience for different purposes (establishing solidarity, persuading, distancing and authority, setting protagonist tone, building rapport with the reader and others).

4.3.5 Summary of the findings on personal pronoun usages and functions. To summarise the discussion of this section, it will be helpful to look at the rhetorical functions that were found for 'I', 'we', and 'you'. Table 4.40 presents a summary of the findings:

Table 4.40

Summary of the Uses and Functions of All Three Pronouns in Texts of All Cognitive Levels

Level 1	I	1. Opinion	2. Being affected by reading	3.Sharing a personal quality/ experience							Total 98 (6.8%)
	We	1.Interpretation	2. Advising	3.Warning							
	You	1.Interpretation	2. Advising	3. Explaining instructions	4.Instruction	5.Definition					
Level 2	I	1. Opinion	2. Being affected by reading	3. Sharing a personal quality/ experience	4. Doer	5.Referring to others					353 (24.7%)
	We	1.Interpretation	2. Advising	3.Warning	4.Prediction	5.Enquiring	6.Ability				
	You	1.Interpretation	2. Advising	3.Prediction	4. Definition	5.Enquiring	6. Indirect question				
Level 3	I	1.Opinion	2.Being affected by reading	3.Sharing a personal quality/ experience	4.Doer	5.Referring to others					897 (62.9%)
	We	1.Interpretation	2.Advising	3.Warning	4.Prediction	5.Enquiring	6.Ability	7. Criticizing	8. Wishing		
	You	1.Interpretation	2.Advising	3.Warning	4.Prediction	5.Enquiring	6.Hypothetical	7. Definition	8.Instruction	9.Referr-ing to others	
Level 4	I	1.Opinion	2. Being affected by reading	3.Sharing a personal quality/ experience							78 (5.4%)
	We	1.Interpretation	2.Advising	3.Prediction	4.Criticizing						
	You	1.Interpretation	2.Advising	5.Referring to others							
Total											1426

If we look at the results quantitatively, we will see that level 4 texts had the least total number of functions of all subjective pronouns among the others (a total of 10). This can be explained by the limited number of texts categorised in this level and also the limited number of pronouns 'I' and 'you' (5.4%) used. The second least used functions of pronouns were seen in the texts of level 1 with 11 functions and a total of 6.7% pronoun usage. The explanation can be related to the feature of the texts of this level which lack elements of writer argumentation and persuasion and are a retelling of the authors' ideas in the original reading texts. The highest uses of these three pronouns (62.9%) and their functions (22) were found in texts of level 3. This is not surprising, due to the feature of texts in this level which show the writers' relating the content to self and others, and therefore their need to use personal pronouns, among other linguistic cues, to refer to themselves and others. Level 2 texts had about 24.7% of all pronouns and a total of 17 functions. To summarise, the texts of levels 2 and 3 had the densest usages and functions of these pronouns, with level 3 texts outnumbering texts of all other levels with a sharp distinction.

Qualitatively, it is evident that the use of personal pronouns for *opinion*, *being recipient of an effect of reading*, *sharing a personal quality or an experience* (for pronoun 'I'), *interpretation* (with the help of shared knowledge and experience), *advising*/*suggestion*, *prediction,* and *warning* are used almost in all texts of cognitive levels (for pronouns 'we' and 'you'). Use of some specific functions such as *ability*, *criticising*, *definition* and *doer* are seen in texts of some levels and not all due to the feature of those texts.

Having presented the results and discussed them in detail in light of the literature, we now turn to the next chapter, Conclusion, to have a summary of the findings and their significance.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary of Findings and Their Significance

Academic reading and writing are both cognitively demanding tasks. According to cognitive theories, learners need to go through a series of stages to achieve automaticity in any skill (Myles, 2002). They are actively involved in skill acquisition and error elimination until it becomes internalised (Al Bulushi, 2011). Acquisition of reading and writing skills is a result of the interaction between the linguistic environment and the learners' internal mechanism (Myles, 2002; Reid, 1993; Zhang, 2004). One of the ways by which these two skills may be developed and internalised, is by integrating them in language classes. Having a reader response approach in a reading class in this study was to highlight the interactive relationship that exists between these two skills. This was in order to help the EFL college students (from two different disciplines) to develop these skills concurrently. This study also looked at the role of the learner in the learning process. By giving students choice in selecting their own reading topics and writing their responses to them (in whatever lengths), it purposed to both motivate the students and also create an interest in them by making them feel involved in their own learning. Besides the pedagogical considerations in having this task in the reading classes, this study also aimed to explore some questions in a number of other areas, the summary of the results derived are presented in the sections that follow.

5.1.1 General Findings on Factors Affecting the Results

Throughout this study, we saw some factors that affected these two groups of students' responses. These factors are their linguistic ability, their discipline, their familiarity with the topic, their view of themselves as writers (whether focusing on the information and being objective or involving themselves and being subjective), their understanding of the purpose of writing and conventions of the reader response genre, and their choice of presenting their selves (whether autobiographical or authorial self) in their writing (probably affected by their view of level of risk involved) and engaging their readers. All these seemingly affected their selection of reading topics, the manner in which they thought about them, and their writing responses; which

displayed varying levels of cognitive engagement with the texts and also had some features of Biber's (1988, as cited in Nesi, 2008) notion of 'different dimensions of academic texts' (i.e. 'involved vs. informational', 'narrative vs. non-narrative', 'explicit vs. situation-dependent', 'persuasive', 'abstract vs. non-abstract'). These factors will be referred to in different sections of this chapter where the findings related to each research question (5.1.2-5.1.4) are summarised.

5.1.2 Reading Topics of Interest, Student Disciplines, and Length of Reader Responses

The first question of this study related to the type of reading topics these two groups of students were interested in reading outside the classroom setting, what impact their disciplinary specialisation had on their choices, and whether the choice of topics affected the length of their responses. The findings indicate that these students were interested in reading topics in the following six areas respectively: *Health*, *Society*, *Literature*, *Psychology, Education*, and *Environment*. However, there were significant differences between the two groups in the frequency of choice of these topics; further indicating the role of language proficiency and discipline on students' choices. It also showed that the choice of a certain topic had a significant role in the length of responses the students produced. In general, the mean length of responses for the reading topics from the highest to the lowest and in that order, belonged to *Psychology*, *Society*, *Health*, *Education*, *Literature*, and *Environment*. Between the disciplines, the pre-med group had a higher number of average words for topics in *Literature*, *Psychology*, *Society*, *Education*, *Health*, and *Environment* respectively. Amongst those from the pre-nursing group, the higher average of words was for *Psychology*, *Education, Literature*, *Society*, *Health*, and *Environment*. This may be related to the role of prior knowledge and topic familiarity which assisted these students to choose certain reading topics (Alkhawaldeh, 2011; Clapham, 2001). The fact that topics affected the length of student responses could also support the schema theory which emphasises the connection between reading and writing. That is, to be able to understand the meaning of a text, the reader has to activate the existing schema to interact with the text. Topics of *Environment*, *Health* and *Society* were probably too specific and required certain types of schemata (field-dependent) which these students apparently had not fully developed. However, topics of *Literature*, *Psychology* and *Education* seem to have been more familiar to them, possibly from their own personal experiences or as a result of their general knowledge. This emphasises the role of learners in the selection of reading topics, something that we should consider in our classroom practices.

The findings also suggest that language proficiency played a role in the choice of reading topics and the average length of responses. The more proficient students, the pre-med group, wrote longer responses in general (an average of 148 words in comparison to an average of 55.89 words for the pre-nursing group) showing the effect of language proficiency on lengths of texts. This has been observed in other studies too (Cahyono, 2000; Ferris, 1994) where the more proficient students produced full length essays with all the necessary rhetorical moves and content elaboration. In Ferris's study (1994), the proficient group (native speakers) outperformed the SL learners in all variables measured and produced longer texts. These longer texts, she believed, enabled the students to show their writing and thinking abilities by including more detail to elaborate the matters being discussed. This emphasises the role of writing in improving reading skills in EFL/ESL classrooms (Graham & Hebert, 2010), something that we as EFL instructors should practice in our classes. The more the learners write, the better their reading comprehension becomes. Similarly, in order to understand a text and make it understood, students need to write extended texts that showcase their analytical ability, interpretive skill and ability to personalise. Also, teaching them writing skills and other processes that are used in formulating well-constructed texts (e.g., teaching text structures, sentence and paragraph construction skills) could lead to more engaging texts that could stimulate the joy of inquiry in learners. As Graham and Hebert (2010) assert, "indeed, young people who do not have the ability to transform thoughts, experiences, and ideas into written words are in danger of losing touch with the joy of inquiry, the sense of intellectual curiosity, and the inestimable satisfaction of acquiring wisdom that are the touchstones of humanity" (p.1).

5.1.3 Levels of Cognitive Engagement with the Reading Texts, Generic Structuring of the Responses, and Interplay between These Two

The second question of this study relates to the characteristics of the student responses in terms of the level of cognitive engagement with the reading text, their generic structuring, and the relationship between these two. It seems that the students' perception of themselves as writers, whether to present information only or to express their views on the matter (Britton et al, 1975, as cited in Honeychurch, 1990) also affected the level of cognitive engagement they displayed in their texts. The model developed and used in this study for categorising and assessing the characteristics of student texts in terms of their level of cognitive engagement had 4 different levels. These levels range from the lowest level of merely repeating or reporting of the

author's ideas, followed by level at which an attempt is made to comprehend the reading content by showing a basic level of evaluation and relating the content to one's prior knowledge. The third level shows some evidence of relating to the content, and the fourth and the highest level, shows the writer's attempt at seeing the reading content in the context of a much bigger and wider picture.

5.1.3.1 Levels of cognitive engagement with the reading texts.

The findings indicate that about 41% of all texts had characteristics of level 2 cognitive engagement probably because this is the practice and expectation of most educational institutions and instructors, where students are expected to show their comprehension of a subject matter (termed 'transactional writing' by Britton et al, 1975). However, another 33% of the texts showed level 3 cognitive engagement, followed by levels 1 and 4 respectively.

Comparing the two groups, the pre-med group's responses had more texts of level 3, than level 2, followed by level 1 and level 4 respectively. The pre-nursing group's texts, however, were more frequently placed under level 2, level 1, level 3 and level 4, indicating how differently these two groups of students responded to a reading task. Nevertheless, the fact that the majority of student responses had the features of cognitive levels 2 and 3, indicates that these students were not only able to focus on the content but also to use their prior knowledge to interpret and connect it to oneself and others. This is yet another important notion that we as educators should be emphasising in our language classes, viewing the content from differing perspectives.

5.1.3.2 Generic structuring of the responses, and interplay between the generic structuring and levels of cognitive involvement.

As for the generic characteristics of responses, it may be concluded that it is related to how learners as writers, shape their responses. Viewing learners as active agents in the reading and writing processes emphasises their role, not only in reading and interpreting a text, by the way they respond to it (cognitive levels of engagement), but also in shaping their responses (generic structuring of their response). It also shows how this generic structuring of student responses is affected by the level of their cognitive engagement and their 'dimly felt sense' of the new genre (Freedman, 1993, as cited in Dawarshi & Reiff, 2010). The analysis shows that like essay studies and some opinion genres such as editorial and commentaries, the reader response genre had three main moves: *Introduction*, *Argument* and *Conclusion*. The *Conclusion Move* was considered as a typical move since it was seen only in 74.6% of the texts, unlike the other two

that were seen in all responses (100%). It also showed that students used different strategies (steps) to realise these moves.

The Introduction Move. For the Introductory Move, there were five steps: g*eneral statement*, *taking a side (*agreeing/disagreeing with the writer), *taking sides* (supporting/rejecting the reading content), *being philosophical*, and *making a connection* (For details refer to Table 4.16). Overall, use of *taking sides* (*supporting/rejecting the reading content*) was the most used introductory step, followed by *general statement*, *making a connection*, *taking a side* (agreeing/disagreeing with the author), and *being philosophical*.

The introductory steps of making a *general statement, taking a side (agreeing and disagreeing),* and *taking sides (supporting/rejecting the content)* were seen in all cognitive levels although with different frequencies. The fact that these three kinds of steps were seen in texts of all cognitive levels might mean that they were more accessible constructs at the students' disposal. Alternatively, it is possible that they had an element of pinpointing the topic and making a general statement about it (*general statement*) or signalling their agreement or disagreement with the author or the content and then developing the ideas further in the *Argument Move* of the genre. Another reason for their use might be that they were more familiar opening sentence strategies as they are semantically close to what students read in their textbooks and are expected to be able to do in their assignments. Students are essentially taught subjects (information) and then are required to reproduce them (Al-Mahrooqi, 2011b; Melzer, 2009; Henry & Roseberry, 1997).

The other two steps named as *Being philosophical* and *Making a specific connection*, were seen only in texts of certain cognitive levels. It was explained that the texts of level 1 cognition, show the least cognitive engagement with the reading text; therefore, it was expected not to see *Making a specific connection* step in texts of this cognitive level. As for *Being philosophical,* it was seen only in texts of levels 2 and 3. The less use of these two steps might be explained that students are usually not expected to draw conclusions (moral of a reading text) or apply a subject or information learned by themselves or others (*making a specific connection*) in their writing as this referring to oneself or the audience is not considered to have a place in academic writing (Biber & Reppen, 1998, as cited in Natsukari, 2012; Breeze, 2006). As such, they probably did not feel that focusing on the gist of a passage or mentioning oneself could be acceptable, an assumption that has been challenged by new theories and studies (Hyland, 2001;

Ivanič & Camps, 2001; Tang & John, 1999) and we, as educators, should introduce these notions to our students.

The Argument Move. While the introductory steps were limited to certain types, the *Argument Move* had a less fixed pattern. It seemed that this move was mostly affected by the genre of the reading passage. However, some patterns seemed to exist between the use of certain introductory steps and the text types used in this move. For example, after the *general statement* step of the *Introduction Move*, the text types of the *Argument Move* were mostly exposition (82.8%, e.g., definition or description, discussing causes and effects) and basic evaluation. Narrative text type was not seen following it at all.

Taking a side (*agreeing/disagreeing*) introductory step, on the other hand, was mostly followed by a persuasive text type in the *Argument Move* (62%) than an expository text type (29.3%). Use of narrative was not seen following this type of introductory step either. As for the introductory step of *taking sides* (*supporting/rejecting the content*), both types of texts, persuasive (43.1%) and expository (39.8%), were used with a small percentage of narrative text type (1.3%). Use of summary writing (15.6%) was also seen following this step.

Although not used often (11 cases in total), *being philosophical* introductory step was not followed by any expository text type but mostly by narrative (45.4%) and persuasive text types (9%). However, a large percentage of the *Argument Move* following this step was summary writing (45.4%).

After *making a connection* introductory step, the most text types used in the *Argument Move* were persuasive (43.8%), narrative (33.3%), and expository (11.6%). About 6.6% of the *Argument Move* was summary writing too. Therefore, it could be concluded that students tended to use certain introductory steps with certain text types. For example, introductory steps such as *taking a side* or *taking sides* acted as springboards for the writer to choose to write a persuasive text type than some other steps like *general statement.* Similarly, *making a connection* introductory step increased the likelihood of usage of narrative text type more than any other introductory step. This can relate to the cognitive processing of the writers (learners) and how they approach a writing task and for what specific purpose. From the cognitive processing aspect, we know that writing involves composition which requires ability to narrate, argue, describe an event or an idea, or transform information into new texts. While some of these (narrating or describing) are relatively easy to do, some others (persuasion) can be difficult for

language learners because they might need to transform or reword the information, which is more complex than the easy task of retelling (Al-Mahrooqi, 2011b; Myles, 2002). This can also be explained by Bhatia's (1997) three interrelated concepts in understanding a genre: communicative purpose, rhetorical moves, and strategies. According to him, communicative purpose is the factor that sets a genre apart from others and determines the types of moves for achieving the purpose, while rhetorical strategies are mainly linguistic in nature and depend on the writer's choice. This can explain that while the communicative purpose of writing reader responses for the students was to give their opinion about the reading texts and they used certain moves to achieve this goal, they used different rhetorical strategies that they thought were more relevant to the presentation of their opinion. The relationship between each specific reading topic and use of certain types of steps was not examined here as it was beyond the scope of this current study.

The Conclusion Move. As for the *Conclusion Move*, there were two broad types of steps: *text-driven* (*summarising*, *restating*) and *writer-driven* (*advising, warning, prediction, opinion, results, unexpected result, rhetorical, wishing, evaluation*). About 10.6% of all concluding steps consisted of *text-driven* steps but the rest were *writer-driven*. The most used types of concluding steps were *advising* (24.8%) and *opinion* (19.5%), two types of *writer-driven* conclusion steps, further emphasising the subjectivity of the texts of reader response genre. This is different from the findings of other studies (Henry & Roseberry, 1997; Hüttner, 2010; Liu, 2015) whereby *text-driven* conclusions (summarising or restating) had dominancy over other types of conclusions. This difference is probably partly due to the nature of those studies which were of an essay genre, in which there was more than one sentence as a conclusion, and partly because of the nature of the reader response genre, which is opinion-based.

Another finding of this study was that some concluding steps were used more in texts of some cognitive levels and some not used at all. For the *text-driven* conclusions, which are relatively more objective, they had the highest frequency in texts of levels 1, 2 and 4. Level 3 texts had the least percentage of objective conclusions (3.7%). Use of *writer-driven* (subjective) conclusions, on the other hand, was highest in texts of levels 3, 4, 2 and 1, emphasising the subjective nature of reader response genre.

The findings here can help teachers to consider teaching different types of conclusions, (*text-driven* or *writer-driven*) to their students. That is, if teachers wish to develop the

summarising or paraphrasing skills of the students, focusing on *text-driven* conclusions could be a suitable means to achieve that. However, if they wish to see more of the writer's involvement by choosing how to shape and finish their texts, they should encourage and help students to think about possible ways in which they can bring to a close, their thoughts on the matter. If writing is seen as a thinking process, it highlights the role of the writers in choosing the way they want to proceed and conclude their texts, whether to reiterate the main points or express their thoughts, opinions, or predictions about the matter being discussed (Kasper, 1996; Liaw, 2007). Bereiter and Scardamlia's (1987, as cited in Myles, 2002) models of writing (knowledge-telling and knowledge-transforming) explain the differences that exist between the proficient and the less proficient L2 writers. They emphasise the role of the knowledge-transforming approach in writing classes, which highlights the role of the students' interest and intent in a writing task and their responsibility for it. Students who do not have practice in tasks that require knowledge-transforming skills probably will not be able to perform them well (Myles, 2002). Therefore, use of *writer-driven* type of conclusions should be encouraged in conjunction with those of *text-driven* in writing classes.

5.1.4 Use of personal pronouns for self-representation and reader engagement, and their rhetorical functions.

The last question of this study was to explore how student writers used personal pronouns to show their identity and what rhetorical functions these pronouns had. In viewing writing as a social act (Grabe, 1990; Hyland, 2001), the writers lead the way for an understanding and agreement between the writer and the reader by using different strategies, some of which are expressing their propositions directly or indirectly and getting their readers involved in their writing. As Hyland (2005) explains, writers try to show their authority and at the same time engage the readers for 'positioning' purposes. On one hand, they use stance (authorial voice) and show their attitudes, judgments and opinions, and on the other hand, they use engagement strategies by acknowledging the readers' presence, relating their propositions to the readers' lives and persuading them to agree with their ideas (Hyland, 2001, 2005). One important grammatical device to achieve this is by the use of interpersonal markers, such as personal pronouns.

In this study, three pronouns (I, we, you) in their subjective forms were examined and their different usages and functions were identified. It was found that the most-used pronoun was

'I' (56%) followed by 'we' (22.7%) and 'you' (21.2%), a finding similar to Herriman's (2007). All three of them were used in their personal and impersonal usages (Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990) with different frequencies in texts of different cognitive levels. This emphasises how learners view themselves as writers. If they think of their role as focusing only on the content or information (as seen in the texts of levels 1 and 2) there are limited ways that they can show their authorial self and engage the audience. However, if they see their role as involving themselves with the content by taking an interest in it and by relating it to oneself, or other people, or issues (levels 3 and 4 of cognitive involvement), the way they present their selves and engage their audience will be different. Another consideration in the use of personal pronouns here can be related to the degree of risk that certain types of positioning would involve. This is an important factor for ESL/EFL learners, as they, particularly the low proficient ones, usually lack confidence in their L2 abilities (Brown, 2000). For example, uses of I think or I believe for *expressing opinion* are low-risk factors (Hyland, 1990) and thus were used more than other rhetorical functions of 'I'. Some other functions of 'I', *shared experiences* and *expressing opinion,* also described as involving a low risk for the writers, were seen in texts of all cognitive levels. This aspect of authorial self (called 'presenting personal experiences' by Clark & Ivanič**,** 1997 as cited in Rodriguez et al, 2011) was also seen in student essays in Rodriguez et al's study (2011). However, use of personal pronouns to show authorial self by 'structuring the essay or text' (Clark & Ivanič, 1997) was not found in this study at all probably because it was a mid- to high-risk factor (showing the 'architect' genre role of the writer explained by Tang & John, 1999), or because it was not an argumentative essay or a well-defined academic genre like a scientific article that would require adherence to a certain type of discourse-specific convention (Hyland, 2002; Swales, 1990; Tang & John, 1999).

In this study, students used first person singular pronoun mainly (80%) to show their stance (*opinion*) towards the subject (33.5%) and to establish their credibility (using *personal experiences*, *shared knowledge*) (46.7%)(Hyland, 2001, 2005; Kuo, 1999). These low-risk functions of 'I' in text of opinion genre allowed these EFL students to express their beliefs and make meaning by showing their interpretation of the content by relating it to their personal experiences or general knowledge. This showed that they used their autobiographical self in this genre (Ivanič & Camps, 2001). Moreover, use of I think or I feel in this study probably acted as a hedging or a politeness device to prevent opposition (Chang, 2014), all of which show the

authorial presence of students in their texts (Ivanič & Camps, 2001). Since use of autobiographical self is an accessible means by which EFL learners can show their identities and create their texts, use of these functions of 'I' should be encouraged in writing classes (Hyland, 2002). Also, use of 'I' to show *being the recipient of an effect of reading*, which basically required and showed the students' understanding, or lack thereof, of the texts, was a function that had a high frequency (15.9%) and corresponded to the function of 'self-benefit' in Hyland's (2002) list of functions of first person pronouns. Thonney (2013) and Hyland (2002) consider this function as involving low risk and as the least powerful function of first person pronoun. Thonney (2013) did not find this function of 'I' in her students' essays and explains that this might be due to the difference between the novice and expert writers. Novice writers, Thonney explains, use first person pronouns to share their personal experiences as a way to support their claims. On the other hand, expert writers support their claims by scientific findings. This is contrary to Herriman's (2007) findings. In this study, students used 'I' to talk about the *effect of reading on themselves* by describing what they understood or did not understand from the reading text or how they felt as a result of reading it (affective appeals). This function being presented in the form of description is a low risk factor with low power as there is no creativity or originality of ideas involved (high risk functions) (Herriman, 2007). This, therefore, may have been a case for the use of this function of 'I' in texts of different cognitive levels in this study. Again, this means that since it is a low-risk factor, use of this kind of function of 'I', to describe something, can be encouraged in a student's writing especially in reflective or expressive writing. Moreover, knowing that descriptive genre is one of the elemental genres (Macken-Horarik, 2002, as cited in Johns, 2003), using this function of 'I' can act as a vehicle to improve students' descriptive writing skills too.

As for pronoun 'we', eight rhetorical functions of *interpretation* (by the use of *shared knowledge*, *shared experience*, *explaining*), *warning*, *advising*, *prediction*, *enquiring*, *ability*, *criticising*, and *wishing* were found. However, these functions were seen with different frequencies in texts of different cognitive levels. Again, whenever students saw their role as active creators of their texts and felt involved (as in texts of level 3), they used more functions of 'we'. When just focusing on the content (level 1), they used 'we' the least. Although they used both inclusive and exclusive forms of 'we' for different purposes, the use of inclusive-we outnumbered (63.3%) that of exclusive-we (36.7%). They made use of inclusive-we for evoking

a sense of communality (Harwood, 2005), positioning the reader favourably towards the argument (Hyland, 2005), identification and solidarity with specific groups of people (Fortanet, 2004), modulating the writer's tone (Chang, 2014), and as a politeness device to reduce the effect of a face-threatening act (Chang, 2014). Use of inclusive-we also blurred the boundary between the reader and the writer and created a sense of solidarity. It seems that when using inclusive-we, students tried to take less risk by being one of others (considered a low-risk factor by Tang & John, 1999) instead of taking stands that would highlight their authority (a high-risk factor considered by Thonney, 2013). Like in Chang's study, students in this study used 'we', especially that of the exclusive, to refer to different social, cultural, racial, religious groups (students, Saudis, women, customers, Muslims and Arabs), apparently in order to create a sense of equality and communality, but again, mostly in texts of level 3 where the writer's authorial self was more present. Therefore, it can be concluded that in this study use of 'we' especially that of exclusive seen in texts of level 3, sets them apart from the other texts in the power relation they displayed. EFL/ESL students should be taught the different power relations that inclusive and exclusive 'we' display. Teaching them just grammatical aspects of pronouns, although necessary and valued, is not complete if their pragmatic aspects are not explained.

As Hyland (2001, 2005) asserts, reader engagement is realised through the use of reader pronouns, directives, questions, shared knowledge and personal asides. Writers often develop their claims and simultaneously try to make them credible by establishing solidarity with the readers. In the current study, use of 'we' in both forms of inclusive and exclusive had functions of *advising* (call for actions) (19%), *questioning* (criticising, enquiring) (5%), and interpretation by the use of shared knowledge (58.4%). Unlike Hyland's study (2005) where 'we' was mostly used in the conclusion part of the research papers to capture the message of the text and relate it to shared responsibility and collective efforts of the related discourse community, students here used 'we' in different parts of their responses and not only in the conclusions. The findings here on the use and functions of 'we' are similar to those of Chang (2014). For example, these would include, establishing solidarity, toning down directives, and presenting a claim. Use of conditional sentences and giving warning, suggesting, possibilities, and advising, all help to foster solidarity. As these functions, mostly by the use of inclusive- or even exclusive-we, again referring to certain groups of people, are in a context of being part of a group (or 'representative' as termed by Tang & John, 1999) are low risk factors, they should be encouraged in EFL/ESL

writing classes in order to increase the students' confidence in presentation of their thoughts before expecting them to venture into taking any rhetorical function that is of a higher risk factor.

However, one point of difference between the findings of this study and Chang's (2014) is as follows. Although as per the model of cognitive levels of engagement, a more self and other involvement in texts, shows a higher level of cognitive involvement, Chang observed that use of these pronouns in student essays depended on the students' levels of language proficiency. She found that usage of personal pronouns decreased from the Low proficient group to the Mid and High groups. The Low group used 'I' more. She speculated that these differences in uses of personal pronouns between the groups might be attributed to the different strategies they had at their disposal, the use of other linguistic devices to present their arguments, or lack of proficiency (Low group) in data collection and finding sources of information, resulting in resorting to their own personal experiences and opinions to present their ideas and persuading the reader to agree. Although all of these might be possible, we should remember that each genre has its own convention and properties (Swales, 1990) and genre of a reading text can affect the reader's response (Breeze, 2007; Zahrarias, 1986). The communicative purpose of a reader response genre is to be a venue for expressing opinions, which in turn makes the text very subjective. In the current study, students of different language proficiency levels produced texts that had evidence of self and other involvement. Thus, the observation that Chang made in her study does not seem to be the case here.

Overall, results on the use of personal pronouns indicate that students although not taught explicitly in their English classes, were able to use rhetorical functions of these pronouns to engage the readers when presenting their propositions, opinions, and arguments. More importantly, the more they tried to see the connections between the reading content and their lives by personalising it (Al Mahrooqi, 2011b; Graham & Hebert, 2010), the more the texts showed of the writers' presence and reader engagement. Therefore, as teachers, we should foster students' self-engagement in their learning to write process by investing in their experience and input and encouraging them to connect their learning to their beliefs and experiences. Students learn better if they feel that their opinions and experiences are important and included in the learning process and as a result, show more creativity in their learning (Small, 2009 as cited in Al-Mahrooqi, 2011b).

Pronoun ‘you’ although the least used pronoun among the three was found to have the most rhetorical functions. It had eleven functions of *instruction*, *explaining the instructions*, *advising*, *prediction*, *warning*, *enquiring*, *indirect questioning*, *hypothesising*, *defining*, *interpreting* (by the use of *shared knowledge*, *shared experience*, and *moral of a story*) and *referring to others*. Rhetorical functions of ‘you’ for interpreting (54%) and advising (18%) had the most frequencies. Texts of level 3 again had the most (nine) uses of rhetorical functions of ‘you’, while level 4 texts had the least (three).

This pronoun was the least used probably because the reader felt a risk, namely, a chance of losing modesty (Chang, 2014) by using it. Based on Speech Act Theory, you-audience is more seen in texts that have an interactive function and feature questions, gathering information, and persuasion, while use of you-general is seen in texts with a descriptive function of language (De Hoop & Hogeweg, 2014). In this study, students used you-audience mostly for the functions of *enquiring*, *instructing*, *advising/suggesting* and *warning*, and therefore added to the interactivity of their texts, while they used you-general mainly for the functions of *interpretation* (relying on *shared knowledge*, *experience*, and *moral of the story*), *referring to others* and *defining* in a context of descriptive language. It is no wonder that students used you-general for *interpretations* and *definitions* as these are the tasks that they presume teachers would want them to be able to do (Al-Mahrooqi, 2011b; Melzer, 2009), and a significant amount of teaching and learning objectives are aimed at ensuring students achieve these skills (e.g., the well-known Bloom’s taxonomy of learning objectives).

In general, this study supports what Rodriguez et al (2011) mentioned about first person pronouns and it is that they are used for different reasons (e.g., those mentioned by Ivanič & Camps,2001 and Hyland, 2001, 2005), but their usage depends on several factors among which are the writers’ status (teacher or student), their level of proficiency in the language used in writing, their cultural background, the writing situation (formal, informal), the topic, and the purpose of the text (writing about one’s opinion or a research article). In the case of the reader response study here, it appears as though the genre of reader response had a significant impact on the use of these pronouns. The highest frequencies were associated with functions of *expressing an opinion*, *advising*, *warning* and *prediction*. Also, the level of language proficiency did play a role in the writing of the students.

5.2 Final Words on Reader Response Task in This Study

Overall, the conclusion that can be drawn about the reader response task is that since students were instructed to select their own reading passages on the topics they were interested in, there were different reading topics belonging to different genres (e.g., short stories, scientific articles, non-scientific articles, movie reviews etc.) observed in this study. An important finding of this study is that the reader response genre had a versatility that easily accommodated different genres or text types (narration, persuasion, exposition) to become embedded in its structure. Also, examination of the interplay between the responses belonging to each cognitive level and their generic structuring showed different patterns of text developments, which were affected by the genre of the reading passage and the writer's thinking process (cognitive level of engagement). Therefore, it would be a valuable learning tool in language classes as it facilitates exposure to different genres and the use of different text types.

However, some might argue that although used in academic settings, reader response might not have some of the characteristics of an academic piece of writing as being objective, having passive structures, and the avoidance of the use of personal pronouns. Petch-Tyson (1998) citing Biber (1987), reiterates that the use of personal pronouns (I, you) indicates a more colloquial and informal nature of a text. In her own study, she mentions that the excessive use of 'you' in student writing undermined the conventions of prose writing which is void of direct reference to the reader, and that the impersonal use of 'you' is common in the spoken modality and not in writing (p. 19). Petch-Tyson further cites Biber and Reppen's (1998) assertion that use of expressions such as I think, I think that, and in my opinion is typical of spoken language and is seldom seen in academic writing. Similarly, Breeze (2007) states that a heavy reliance on the use of personal pronouns in writing is perceived as producing speech-like texts. Use of 'I' and more specifically 'you' is often associated with a text as being too personal and not suitable for use in academic presentation (Breeze, 2007, p. 15). Also considering these features (informal language, use of personal pronouns, use of personal experiences) in her findings, Breeze draws a conclusion, that essay prompts that assumed to be asking about the student's opinions resulting in a high usage of I think and other such expressions, made the students follow the norms of spoken mode rather than written mode. In this study, from 378 texts included in the genre analysis, expression of I think was used 99 times, I believe 27, I agree 28, and in my opinion 44 times. Therefore, we could say that the reader response genre has more spoken language features

by the high usage of personal pronouns, limited use of passive voice, use of informal language, and overt use of opinions. However, using this task in our classroom can act as a basis on which academic writing may be developed. We can say that academic writing starts by writers writing for themselves relying on personal experiences, but gradually moving towards a more academic form of writing. This is also supported by Cadman (1997, as cited in John, 2009) who believes that at the beginning stages of academic writing, writers present biographical self but eventually replace them with a more academic self to present their ideas to a broader, more expert audience.

And the last point about reader response task involves academic dimensions seen in it. Nesi (2008) and Gardner and Nesi (2013) in their study of British Academic Written English (BAWE) corpus, which is based on the student writings belonging to different university levels (years of study) and disciplines, used the concept of 'dimensions of academic texts' from Biber (1988, as cited in Nesi, 2008) to describe their findings. The dimensions are named as 'involved vs. informational', 'narrative vs. non-narrative', 'explicit vs. situation-dependent', 'persuasive', 'abstract vs. non-abstract'. They found that in all university levels, texts of students showed less 'involvement', meaning more focus was on the object of the study than on the author (student). Dimension of 'narrative' was seldom seen, again because the focus of students was on building arguments more so than presenting narratives. 'Persuasiveness' was not seen since students opted to present content in a factual manner with no great persuasiveness perhaps thinking that the importance of the subject was clear to the reader and did not require persuasion. They also found that Arts and Humanities' assignments required more 'narrative-like' writing and were the least 'persuasive' while Social Sciences based writings were more 'explicit'. Life Sciences' writings were most objective opposed to subjective, and Physical Sciences' writings were most 'abstract' and least 'narrative'. In light of these findings, for this study some generalisations can be drawn about the students' responses related to the level of cognitive engagement with the texts. From the students' texts in each cognitive level, we could see that some of these dimensions are seemingly more prominent than others. For example, it seems that texts of levels 1 and 2 show dimension of 'informational' more than 'involved' and they tend to fall more on the dimension of 'non-narrative' than 'narrative'. Texts of levels 3 and 4 show more 'involved' dimension than 'informational', and some aspects of 'narrative' are seen in level 3 texts. Level 4 texts, generally have more 'persuasive' dimension. We could also say that the reader response genre shows more 'non-abstract' than 'abstract' dimension. However, second language

proficiency, topics of the reading texts, students' discipline, and what view they hold about their role as writer play a role in the level of students' cognitive engagement with the texts and subsequently in their reader responses.

5.3 Pedagogical Implications

Academic writing is a complex process for EFL/ESL students since they need to master their competency in L2 as well as learn the writing conventions (Kroll, 1990). However, findings of this exploratory study have some pedagogical implications that can help teachers in their EFL/ESL classroom practices. They are the following:

1. Reading and writing are interconnected skills and should be taught in combination. No matter what the direction of the interactivity between these two skills is, incorporating them reinforces both skills. EFL/ESL teachers not only need to connect writing and reading activities but also to provide students with opportunities to become reflective readers and writers. Students need to see that reading and writing are communicative acts and have communicative purposes and are therefore inseparable. This will help them become more proficient in their language learning in a more meaningful way.

2. Classroom tasks should be engaging and assist students in comprehending, manipulating, producing, and interacting in the second language with a focus on making meaning rather than on form (Nunan, 1989). A good example of such a classroom task is the use of reader response as it actively engages students to explore and discover meaning through reading and help produce their own meaningful texts. This eventually helps them achieve a certain level of automaticity in writing which in turn prepares them to produce the types of texts that they are required to write for their college courses.

3. Students should be given opportunities to frequently write about the texts they read. The more they write, the better their reading comprehension becomes because they will be recording, synthesising, analysing, personalising, and manipulating the ideas in the text. Better understanding of a text is achieved when students write extended texts using analysis, interpretation, or personalisation.

4. Use of such learner-centred approach also cultivates critical thinking and fosters autonomous learning. It provides students with opportunities to express themselves and use their experiences in their writing. It personalises the learning act (reading/writing) and encourages their creativity.

The findings here show that students were engaged in different forms and levels of reasoning from one reading topic to another.

5. Giving students choices in reading topics will motivate them to get engaged with reading and choose the topics that are of interest to them, which occasionally may not necessarily be the choice of the teachers. The findings here emphasise the role of discipline in the choice of reading topics. Therefore, some classroom practices such as use of literary texts might not be the choice of students if given a chance (as shown in Martin & Lauri's study cited in Liaw, 2001). Instead, students apparently prefer to make the best use of their time and choose some non-literary reading texts that are either of their field of study (e.g., health) or on some other social, psychological, or educational issue.

6. Whether topics are chosen by teachers or by students, the reading texts can be both literary and non-literary. This would expose students to a greater variety of text types and provide them with an opportunity to experience reading and writing of different types of texts, which are necessary for academic performance.

7. Students' responses to topics of reading can be affected by their linguistic ability as well as by the topic itself. The less proficient students should be encouraged to write more by developing their ideas in more detail. These students usually lack lexical and syntactical knowledge. By requiring them to write more, the areas of their deficiencies can be identified and addressed in post writing sessions. Accordingly, teachers can provide their students with language use, vocabulary and grammar structures that can enhance the students' productive skills. Enriching the students' linguistic knowledge will enable them to write fluently, produce longer texts, and improve their writing quality.

8. In language classes, drawing the students' attention to different levels of cognitive involvement with topics should be emphasised. Although reporting or narrating (level 1) and showing comprehension (level 2) of the reading or a listening topic are important, they belong to the lower levels of cognitive involvement. Instead, drawing the students' attention to connecting the topics to themselves or to other specific groups of people (level 3) and to other broader social, ethical, or political issues (level 4) will promote critical thinking. This will help them to see the interconnectedness between issues.

9. In general, the results of this study show that unlike the more proficient students, the less proficient group had a higher percentage of texts showing lower levels of cognitive engagement.

Therefore, instructors should not only ask students to focus on the main ideas or supporting details but they should also give them opportunities to elaborate more, synthesise the information, and for inter-textual connections.

10. Although the results on genre analysis show that the students' 'dimly felt senses' of new genres helped them to shape the form of their responses, familiarising the students with the genre of reader response before implementing it in class, can facilitate their learning by showing the students what its different moves are and what steps they can use to realise these moves. Also drawing the students' attention to the genre of reading passages (expository, persuasion, narrative) in a reading class and teaching them the characteristics of each genre will broaden their knowledge of these elemental genres which can be used in variety of writing activities such as essay writing, reporting, critique, and personal response.

11. Personal pronouns are inter-subjective devices. They have multiple semantic referents, which facilitate the writer's expression of opinions, knowledge claims and the structuring of texts. Depending on the function, writers use personal pronouns to reflect the writers' egocentricity or solidarity, involvement or distance and sympathy or indifference in discourse (Harwood, 2005). Therefore, use of personal pronouns is not only a grammatical point to be covered in language classes but additionally, their sociolinguistic and pragmatic/rhetorical properties should be pointed out to the students as well.

12. Knowing about the three selves that writers bring into the text (autobiographical self, discoursal self, and authorial self) is important for the students but is seldom discussed or practiced in writing classes. By drawing the students' attention to these pronouns in light of writer identity and writer voice, we can empower students to make use of them for positioning and engaging their readers. Some of the helpful ways to do this are by way of self-reflection (reflecting on the rhetoric of literature in their field) and data-driven learning- using the concordance to locate first and second person pronouns and their collocates (Hyland, 2001). If students are given a chance to write about a topic they have more knowledge of than their audience, they will probably show more authority and use first person pronouns in the manner in which experts do so. By using the students' drafts for reflection on the use of first person pronouns, they can see how to start with a personal experience (autobiographical self) and move towards a more academic identity (authorial self).

13. Although ESL/EFL students should learn about functions and usages of first and second person pronouns, they should know that the overuse of these pronouns has its drawbacks.

5.4 Limitations of This Study, and Future Research

This exploratory study achieved what it aimed to do; however, there are some issues and recommendations that may be considered for future research. Firstly, I need to reemphasise that the reader response genre studied here was on student texts (not on expert writers' texts) and on EFL students (not on native-speaking students). Both may affect creation and structure of a text (or genre). Therefore, findings of this study could only be generalised to EFL students in a tertiary level in Arab countries (considering the effect of cultural background). Similar studies in other parts of the world and with both EFL and native speakers of English will probably shed more light on the questions that this study aimed to address. Secondly, it would be informative to know whether a bigger sample of student responses would produce the same results. In this study, the sample size was 600 (student response), some of which (222) were not included in the genre analysis due to them not being sufficiently extended enough to have any generic structure. A bigger sample size could probably provide more data for discourse analysis.

Another issue is that being an original research study, my purpose was to find out the type of topics precisely these students were interested in reading instead of giving them some prepared articles or reading passages, as most of studies in this area have used. Although this gave the students more control over what they wanted to read, it would be informative to know what level of cognitive engagement with the texts the students would exhibit if the topics and reading texts were more controlled and teacher-selected. A difficulty that this study faced due to this factor was the complexity associated with finding a specific pattern of genre moves. As a result of the students' writing on a wide range of reading topics, the *Argument Move* of this genre was varied in its structure by some having a narrative text type and others having a persuasive or expository type. Another research study needs to be undertaken to investigate how the control of writing topic would affect the genre of reader response especially on non-literary texts. Also, it would be informative to investigate the relationship between reading topics and the use of certain types of introductory steps. This could possibly shed some light on whether the reading topic has any relation to the type of introductory step chosen and the text type of the *Argument Move*.

Additionally, students in this study were not given any marks for their responses. If they were given specific feedback and marks on their responses, that might have produced a different

kind of result. For example, by giving feedback on their writing and asking them to elaborate on their ideas, the incidence of responses that consisted of a few words or a couple of sentences (as seen in this study) would have been reduced. Another methodology that could be used in future studies may be use of a questionnaire or an interview to delve more into the intentions, likes and dislikes, and opinions of the students about the reader response task, about reading and writing in general, and reading and writing topics. This could immensely enrich the study and provide a fuller picture of the students as writers.

All in all, the concept of *connection* seems to be an encompassing notion to consider in our pedagogical approaches to the teaching and learning of English. Students should be made aware of it for purposes of meaning making and making meaning. We can do this by connecting reading and writing tasks in the classroom and tailoring our classroom practices to the interests of the students by giving them choices in selecting the topics they like to read and then write about. We could also encourage them to connect writing to thinking and also motivate students to produce and elaborate their ideas as much as they possibly can. We could further extend this process by getting the students to connect reading contents to their lives and personal experiences, and concurrently get them to connect reading contents to the broader social, ethical, political issues. Connecting the teaching of different genres' conventions to our traditional classroom practices will also help to heighten our EFL/ESL students' awareness about them. By getting the students to connect the writer roles to them, we could expect the students to see themselves as writers and therefore assist in developing their authorial self besides merely presenting their autobiographical self. In a nutshell, in a world where everything to some extent affects everything else to a certain degree, we have more reasons to use teaching practices that highlight inter-connectedness of ideas and skills whenever we read, write or think about something.

REFERENCES

Abdel Latif, M. (2008). The relationship of linguistic knowledge, affective traits and writing quality with EFL writers' text length aspects. *Essex Graduate Student Paper in Language and Linguistics, 10(1),* 1-21.

Abdel Latif, M. (2009). *Egyptian EFL student teachers' writing processes and products: The role of linguistic knowledge and writing affect* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Essex, UK. Retrieved from http://www.tirfonline.org/wp-ntent/uploads/2010/10/AbdelLatifsummary.pdf.

AbulHaq, F. (1982). *An analysis of syntactic errors in the composition of Jordanian secondary students* (Unpublished master's thesis). Yarmouk University, Jordan.

Afful, J. (2010). Rhetorical choices in introduction of examination essays: A cross-disciplinary study. *Glossa, 5 (2),* 138-165.

Ahmed, A. H. (2010). Students' problems with cohesion and coherence in EFL essay writing in Egypt: Different perspectives. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal, 1 (4),* 211-221.

Al-Bulushi, Y. (2011). Short stories in the Omani context: The use of the reader-response theory. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal, 2(3),* 450-455.

Al Humaidi, M. M. (2008). *Planning in the writings of Saudi EFL learners at the College of Languages and Translations at KSA* (Unpublished master's thesis). King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.

Al-Jurf, R. S. (2004). *What our youth read in the age of globalization*. A paper presented at the Symposium of Globalization and Priorities of Education, King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.

Al-Khairi, M.A. (2013). Saudi English-major undergraduates' academic writing problems: A Taif University perspective. *English Language Teaching, 6 (6)*, 1-12. doi:10.5539/elt.v6n6p1 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n6p1. Retrieved from www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/viewFile/27256/16549

Al khawaldeh, A. (2011). The Effect of EFL reading comprehension on writing achievement

among Jordanian eighth grade students. *European Journal of Scientific Research, 66(3),* 352-365.

Al-Mahrooqi, R. I. (2011a). A quantitative and a qualitative analysis of the effect of culture and language on Arab students' responses to authentic literature in English. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 1 (11)*, 1561-1570.

Al-Mahrooqi, R. I. (2011b). The responses of native and non-native speakers of English short stories. *Arab World English Journal, 2 (1),* 123-141.

Al Musallam, E. I. (2009). *College instructors' and learners' attitudes to authentic EFL reading materials in Saudi Arabia* (Unpublished master's thesis). King Saud University, Saudi Arabia.

Al-Nafisah, K., & Al-Shorman, R.A. (2010). Saudi EFL students' reading interests. *Journal of King Saud University – Languages and Translation (2011) 23*, 1–9.

Al-Nujaidi, A. (2003). *The relationship between vocabulary size, reading strategies and reading comprehension of EFL learners in Saudi Arabia* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Oklahoma State University-Stillwater, US.

Al Salmi, M. (2011a). *Reading difficulties among Saudi ESL students of intermediate level*. Mohammed University, Morocco.

Al Salmi, M. (2011b). *Anxiety among ESL/EFL students: The example of reading anxiety*. Retrieved from http://www.upublish.info/rssauthor/130569.XML

Al Samadani, H. A. (2011). Saudi students' awareness of reading strategies and factors affecting their EFL comprehension. *British Journal of Arts and Sciences, 2 (2),* 75-87.

Al-Shorman, R. A., & Batineh, R. F. (2004). Jordanian EFL university students' reading interests. *Abhath Al-Yarmouk (The Journal of Yarmouk University/Humanities and Social Sciences Series), 21 (3a),* 35-56.

Al-Shumaimari, Y. A. (2006). The effects of content familiarity and language ability on reading comprehension on performance of low-and high-ability Saudi tertiary students studying English as a foreign language. *Journal of King Saud University, 18 (2) (Education Science and Islamic Studies)*, 1-19.

Al-Sudies, T. A. (2005). *Using the meta-cognitive awareness approach for developing teaching the writing skill to students of the English department at the Faculty of Education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Girls' Faculty of Education, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Andrews, E. (1989). *The effects of assigned and unassigned topics on the length and syntactic complexity of grade-three writing with ta survey of gender difference in unassigned topic choice and environments of interest* (Unpublished master's thesis). Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada.

Ankawi, A. (2015). The Academic Writing Challenges Faced by Saudi Students Studying in New Zealand (Unpublished master's thesis). Auckland University of Technology, New Zealand. Retrieved from http://aut.researchgateway.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10292/9187/AnkawiA.pdf?sequence=3

Azar, B., & Hagen, S. (2011). *Fundamentals of English Grammar* (4th Ed.). Pearson Longman, NY.

Bacon, S., & Finneman, M. (1990). A study of attitudes, motives and strategies of university foreign language students and their disposition to authentic oral and written input. *The Modern Language Journal, 74 (4)*, 459-473.

Bahrebar, S., & Darabad, A. (2013). Writing in the foreign language classroom: The effects of prompts on the Iranian learners of English. *International Journal of English Language Education, 1 (3),* 1-15. doi:10.5296/ijele.v1i3.3492
Retrieved from
http://www.macrothink.org/journal/index.php/ijele/article/viewFile/3492/2907

Bean, J., & Chien, N. (2000). How interest affects comprehension of reading passages of various difficulties. *Education Psychology Index*. Retrieved from
http://www.sccs.swarthmore-edu/users/01/syllyb/ed21.htm

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1982). From conversation to composition: The role of instruction in a developmental process. *Advances in instructional psychology, 2,* 1-64.

Bhatia, V.K. (1993). *Analyzing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. Pearson Education LTD.

Bhatia, V.K. (1997). Review article: On Vijay K. Bhatia's analyzing genre: Langue use in professional setting (1993). *Hermes, Journal of linguistics, 19,* 207-239.

Bonyadi, A. (2014). The Effect of topic selection on EFL students' writing performance. *SAGE Open, July-Sep,* 1-9. DOI: 10.1177/2158244014547176. Retrieved from http://sgo.sagepub.com/content/spsgo/4/3/2158244014547176.full.pdf

Bonzo, D. (2008). To assign a topic or not: Observing fluency and complexity in intermediate

foreign language writing. *Foreign Language Annals, 41,* 722-735.

Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (1985). *Turning experience into learning*. New York, NY: Kogan Page/Nichols.

Brantmeier, C. (2003). Does gender make a difference? Passage content and comprehension in second language reading. *Reading in a foreign language, 15 (1),* 1-22.

Breen, M. (1985). Authenticity in the language classroom. *Applied Linguistics, 6,* 60-70.

Breeze, R. (2007). How personal is this text? Researching writer and reader presence in student writing using Wordsmith tools. *COREL: Computer Resources for Language Learning, 1,* 14-21.

Brems, M., & Jones, S. (2008). *Catalyst: Writing from Reading 2*. Thomson Heinle.

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* Pearson Education: White Plains, New York.

Cacchiani, S. (2007). *From narratives to intensification and hyperbole: Promotional uses of book blurbs.* Paper n. 79 in Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics Conference. CL 2007, M. Davies, P. Rason, S. Hunston, P. Danielsson (eds.). Retrieved from http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/publications/CL2007/paper/79_Paper.pdf

Cahyono, B. (2000). Rhetorical strategies used in the English persuasive essays of Indonesian university students of EFL. *Kata, 2 (1),* 31-39. Retrieved from http://ced.petra.ac.id/index.php/ing/article/view/15457

Carlisle, A. (2000). Reading logs: An application of reader-response theory in ELT. *ELT Journal, 54 (1),* 12-19.

Carroll, V. (1997). Learning to read, reading to learn. *EDRS Opinion Papers*. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED413588.pdf

Chandler, D. (1997). *'An introduction to genre theory'*. Retrieved from http://visual-memory.co.uk/daniel/Documents/intgenre/chandler_genre_theory.pdf

Chuming, W. (2005). The length approach to ELT. *Reflection on English Language Teaching, 4,* 15-25.

Chang, C. (2006). Effect of topic familiarity and linguistic difficulty on the reading strategies and mental representation of the non-native readers of Chinese. *Journal of Language and Learning, 4(2)*, 172-198.

Chang, y. (2014). Personal pronouns in argumentative essays: Discourse function and pattern of

use. *Journal of English Education, 3 (1),* 93-129.

Che Lah, Y., & Hashim, N. (2014). The acquisition of comprehension skills among high and low achievers of year 4 to 6 students in primary school. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 114,* 667-672.

Clapham, C. (2001). Discipline specificity and EAP. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 84-100). Cambridge University Press.

Clark, R. & Ivanič, R. (1997). The politics of writing. London. Routledge.

Coady, J. (1979). A psycholinguistic model of ESL reader. In R. Mackay, B. Barkman and R. Jordan (eds.), *Reading in a second Language: Hypotheses, organization and practice* (pp. 5-12). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Connor, U., & Mauranen, A. (1999). Linguistic analysis of grant proposal: European Union research grants. *English for Specific Purposes, 18 (1),* 47-62.

Cordon, R. (2000). Reading-writing connections: the importance of interactive discourse. *English in Education, 34 (2).*

Correll, P. L. (1987). Content and formal schemata in ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly, 21(3),* 461-81.

Crossley, S. (2008). The effects of genre analysis pedagogy: A corpus-based and situational analysis. *Foreign languages for specific purposes, 7,* 20-35.

Crossley, S., McCarthy, P., Louwerse, M., & McNamara, D. (2007). A linguistic analysis of simplified and authentic texts. *The Modern Language Journal, 91 (1),* 15-30.

Dawarshi, A., & Reiff, M. (2010). *Genre: An introduction to history, theory, research, and pedagogy*. Indiana: Parlor Press and the WAC Clearinghouse.

DeGroff, L. C. (1989). The influence of prior knowledge on writing, conferencing, and revising. *The elementary school Journal, 88 (2),* 105-118.

De Hoop, H., & Hogeweg, L. (2014). The use of second person pronouns in a literary work. *Journal of Literary Semantics, 43 (2),* 109-125.

Dekker, M. (1993). Books, reading, and response: A teacher-researcher tells a story. *The New Advocate, 4,* 37-45.

Ding, H. (2007). Genre analysis of personal statements: analysis of moves in application essays to medical and dental schools. *English for specific purposes, 26,* 368-92.

Dressel, J. H. (1996). The effects of listening to and discussing different qualities of children's Literature on the narrative writing of fifth graders. *Research in the teaching of English, 24 (4)*, 397-414.

Driscoll, W., Gelabert, M., & Richardson, N. (2010). Efficacy of using learning communities to improve core chemistry education and increase interest and retention in chemistry. *J. Chem. Educ.*, *87*, 49-53.

Dreyfuss, K., & Barilla, R. (2005). *Making meaning through written response: An action research inquiry*. Teachers Network Leadership institution.

Dyment, J. E., & O'Connell, T. (2010). Assessing the quality of reflection in student journals: A review of the research. *Teaching in Higher Education, 16 (1),* 81-97.

Eckhoff, B. (1983). How reading affect children's writing. *Language Arts, 60 (6)*, 607-616.

Elder, L., & Paul, R. (1994). Critical thinking: Why we must transform our teaching. *Journal of Developmental Education, 18 (1)*, 34-35.

El-Sayed, A. (1982). *An investigation into syntactic errors of Saudi freshmen's English Composition* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University of Pennsylvania, US.

Fageeh, A. I. (2003). *Saudi college students' beliefs regarding their English writing difficulties* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University of Pennsylvania, US.

Feng, H., & Shi, L. (2004). Genre analysis of research grant proposals. *LSP and Professional communication, 4 (1),* 8-30.

Ferreira, D. (2013). Researching the effect of students' self-selecting topics on writing fluency. *Ferris Studies, 48,* 297-306.

Ferris, D. R. (1994). Lexical and syntactic features of ESL writing by students at different levels of L2 proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly, 28 (2),* 414-420.

Flateby, T. (2009). Developments and changes resulting from writing and thinking assignments. *Research and Practice in Assessment, 3 (1),* 1-6.

Flowerdew, L. (2000). Using a genre-based framework to teach organizational structures in Academic writing. *ELT journal, 54 (4),* 369-378.

Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (2001). The EAP curriculum: Issues, methods, and challenges. In J. Flowerdew & M. Peacock (eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 84-100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fortanet, I. (2004). The use of 'we' in university lectures: reference and function. *English for Specific Purposes, 23,* 45-66.

Gardner, S., & Nesi, H. (2013). A classification of genre families in university student writing. Manuscripts submitted to *Applied Linguistics, 34 (1),* 25-52. Retrieved from https://curve.coventry.ac.uk/open/file/64b82bdd-f91d-86f9-f661-cc472fbe523a/1/gardnercomb.pdf

Gecikli, M. (2012). A genre-based analysis study on the rhetorical organization of English and Turkish PhD thesis in the field of English language teaching. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology, 3 (6),* 50-58.

Ghaemi, F., & Sheibani, R. (2014). Genre-based analysis of English patient information leaflets. *International journal of English language and linguistics research, 2 (2),* 50-55.

Goodman, K. S. (1967). Reading: A psycholinguistic guessing game. *Journal of the Reading Specialist, 6,* 126-135. Retrieved from http://www.uel.br/pessoal/sreis/pages/arquivos/TEXTOS/LEITURA%20EM%20LINGUA%20INGLESA/GOODMAN_Reading_a%20psycholinguistic%20guessing%20game.pdf

Grabe, W. (1991). Current developments in second language reading research. *TESOL Quarterly, 25 (3),* 375-406.

Gradwohl, J., & Schumachier, G. (1989).The Relationship between Content Knowledge and Topic Choice in Writing. *Written Communication, 6 (2),* 181-195.

Graham, S., & Hebert, M. (2010). *Writing to read: evidence for how wring can improve reading: ACarnegie Corporation Time to Act Report*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.

Grant, L., & Ginther, A. (2000). Using computer tagged linguistics features to describe L2 writing differences. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 9 (2),* 123-145.

Halliday, M. A., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hancock, M. (1993). Exploring and extending personal response through literature journals. *The Reading Teacher, 46,* 466-474.

Harwood, N. (2005). 'We do not seem to have a theory… The theory I present here attempts to fill this gap": Inclusive and exclusive pronouns in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics, 26 (3),* 343-375.

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995) Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11 (10),* 33-49.

Hayes. J. R., & Flower, L.S. (1980). Identifying the organization of writing processes. In L.W. Gregg and E.R. Steinberg (eds.), *Cognitive process in writing* (pp. 31-50). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Association.

Henry, A., & Roseberry, R. (1997). An investigation of the functions, strategies and linguistic features of the introductions and conclusions of essays. *System, 25 (4),* 479-495.

Herriman, J. (2007). "I'm stating my case": Overt authorial presence in English argumentative texts by students and professional writers. *Nordac Journal of English Studies, 6 (1)*, retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download;jsessionid=AF64FA44905D28BDD6428415DCD6B622?doi=10.1.1.537.247&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Hirvela, A. (1996). Reader-response theory and ELT. *ELT Journal, 50(2),* 127-134.

Hirvela, A. (2001). Incorporating reading into EAP writing courses. In J. Flowerdew & M. (eds.), *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes* (pp. 84-100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hrisonopulo, K. (2007). Who is to believe when you bet: On non-referential indexical functions of the pronoun you in English. *Culture, language and representation, 5,* 241-253.

Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (Eds.). (2000). *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hüttner, J. (2010). Purpose-built corpora and student writing. *Journal of writing research, 2 (2),* 197-218.

Hyland, K. (1990). A genre description of the argumentative essay. *RELC Journal, 21,* 66-78.

Hyland, K. (2001). Bringing in the reader: Addressee features in academic articles. *Written Communication, 18 (4),* 549-574.

Hyland, K. (2002). Authority and invisibility: Authorial identity in academic writing. *Journal of pragmatics, 34,* 1091-1112.

Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies, 7 (2),* 173-192.

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2009). 'The leading journal of its field': Evaluation in journal descriptions. *Discourse Studies, 11 (6),* 703-720.

Intaraprawt, P. (1995). The use of metadiscourse in good and poor ESL essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 4 (3),* 253-272.

Intarparawat, P., & Steffensen, M. (1995). The use of meta –discourse in good and poor ESL essays. *Journal of Second language Writing, 4,* 253-272. 10.1016/1060-3743(95)90012-8 . Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1060-3743(95)90012-8.

Ippolito, J., Steele, J., & Samson, J. (2008). Why adolescent literacy matters now? *Harvard Educational Review, 78 (1),* 3-5.

Ivanič, R., & Camps, D. (2001). I am how I sound: Voice as self-representation in L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 10*, 3-33.

Jahin, J, H., & Idrees, M. W. (2012). EFL major student teachers' writing proficiency and attitudes towards learning English. *Umm AL- Qura University Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences,* 4 (1), 10-72.

Jarvis, S., Grant, L., Bikowski, D., & Ferris, D. (2003). Exploring multiple profiles of highly rated learner compositions. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 12,* 377-403.

Jenson, S., & Joy, C. (2005). Exploring a model to evaluate levels of reflection in Baccalaureate Nursing students' journal. *Journal of Nursing Education, 44 (3),* 139-142.

Ji, X. (2011). Topic effects on writing performance: What do students and their writings tell us? *The journal of Asia TEFL, 8 (1),* 23-38.

John, S. (2007). Meeting the challenge of developing an academic identity: A textual approach. In P. Teo and C. Ho (eds.), *Discourse in the modern world: Perspectives and challenges* (pp. 28–52). Singapore: McGraw- Hill.

John, S. (2012). Identity without 'I': A study of citation sequences and writer identity literature review sections of dissertations. In R. Tang (Ed.) *Academic writing in a second or foreign language: Issues and Challenges Facing ESL/EFL Academic Writers in Higher Education Contexts* (pp. 186-203). London: Bloomsbury Academic.

Johns, A. (2003). Genre and ESL/EFL composition instruction. In Kroll, B. (eds.), *Exploring the dynamics of second language writing* (pp.195-217).

Johnson, P. (1981). Effects on reading comprehension of language complexity and culture background of a text. *TESOL Quarterly, 15,* 169-181.

Kasper, L.F. (1997). The impact of content-based instructional programs on the academic progress of ESL students. *English for Specific Purposes, 16 (4)*, 309-320.

Katajamaki, H., & Koskela, M. (2006). The rhetorical structure of editorials in English, Swedish and Finnish business newspapers. *Teokessa, Proceedings of the 5th International Aelfe Conference,* 215-219.

Kellem, H. (2009). The formeaning response approach: Poetry in the EFL classroom. *English Teaching Forum, 4,* 12-17.

Kennedy, B. (1994). The role of topic and the reading/writing connection. *The Electronic Journal for Teaching English as a Second Language, 1 (1). R*etrieved from http://www.tesl-ej.org/wordpress/issues/vloume1/ej01/ej01a3/

Khan, I. A. (2011).Learning difficulties in English: Diagnosis and pedagogy in Saudi Arabia. *Educational Research, 2 (7),* 1248-1257.

Kies, D. (1990). Indeterminacy in sentence structure. *Linguistics and education 2,* 231-258.

Kitagawa, C., & Lehrer, A. (1990). Impersonal uses of personal pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics,14,* 739-759.

Kobrin, J. L., Deng, H., & Shaw, E.J. (2007). Does quantity equal quality? The relationship between length of response & scores on the SAT essay. *Journal of Applied Testing Technology, 8 (1),* 1-15.

Krashen, S. D. (2003). *Free voluntary reading: Still a very good idea*. From the author's site, retrieved from http://www-bcf.usc.edu/~genzuk/Free_Voluntary_Reading-Krashen/FVReading3-Krashen.pdf

Krashen, S., & Lee, S. Y. (2004). Competence in foreign language writing: Progress and lacunae. *Literacy Across Cultures, 12 (2),* 10-14.

Krathwohl, D.R. (2002). A revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An overview. *Theory into Practice, 41(4)*, 212-218.

Kusel, P. (1992). Rhetorical approaches to the study and composition of academic essays. *System, 20 (4),* 457-469.

Kuo, C. (1999). The use of personal pronouns: Role relationships in scientific journal articles *English for Specific Purposes, 18 (2), 121-138.*

Lagan, J. (2013). *Exploring writing: Sentences and Paragraphs* (3rd edition). McGraw Hill Education.

Lanauze, M., & Snow, C. (1989). The relation between first and second language writing skills:

Evidence from Puerto Rican elementary school children in bilingual programs. *Linguistics and Education, 1 (4),* 323-339.

Langar, J., & Filhan, S. (2000). Writing and reading relationships: Constructive tasks. In R. Drisano and J. R. Squire (eds.), *Writing research/theory/practice*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Lareaus, S. , Pandolfio, J., Rand, D., & Turner, C. (2006). The impact of expository text structure knowledge on fifth and eighth grade student' expository writing. *The Literacy Looking-glass,5 (1),* 1-19.

Lavin-Crerand, M. E. (1993). From first language literacy to second language proficiency to second language literacy: Writing in a foreign language context (Doctoral dissertation). Ohio State University, US. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 53 (5),* 1432A. Retrieved from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/rws_etd/document/get/osu1239369687/inline

Lee, H. (2013). The reader- response e-journal: an alternative way to engage low-achieving EFL students. *Language Teaching Research, 17 (1),* 111-131.

Liaw, M. (2001). Exploring literary responses in an EFL classroom. *Foreign Language Annals, 34 (1),* 35-45.

Liaw, M. (2007). Content-based reading and writing for critical thinking skills in an EFL context. *English Teaching and Learning, 31 (2),* 45-87.

Lieungnapar, A., & Todd, R. (2011). Top-down versus bottom-up approaches toward move analysis in ESP. *Proceedings of the International Conference: Doing Research in Applied Linguistics*, 21-22 April 2011, Bangkok. Retrieved from http://arts.kmutt.ac.th/dral/PDF%20proceedings%20on%20Web/1-10_Top-down_versus_Bottom-up_Approaches_toward_Move_Analysis_in_ESP.pdf

Liton, H. A. (2012). Developing EFL teaching and learning practices in Saudi colleges: A review. *International Journal of Instruction, 5 (2),* 129-152.

Liu, D. (2015). Moves and wrap-up sentences in Chinese students' essay conclusions. *SAGE Open,* 1-9.

Lopez, P. (2012). The use of a case study approach to examine the construction of identity in an undergraduate dissertation written in a foreign language. *Papers from the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics and Language Teaching,* 141-159.

Martin, I. P. (2011). Representations of self in reflection essays of Philippine university students.

Reflections on English Language Teaching, 10 (1), 55-66.

Martines, I. (2005). Native and non-native writers' use of first person pronouns in the different sections of biology research articles in English. *Journal of second language writing, 14, 174-190*.

McCrostie, J. (2008). Writer visibility in EFL learner academic writing: A corpus-based study. *ICAME Journal, 32,* 97-114.

McGinley, W. (1992). The role of reading and writing while composing from sources. *Reading Research Quarterly, 27 (3),* 226-247.

McNamara, D., Crossley, S., & McCarthy, P. (2010). Linguistic features of writing quality. *Written Communication, 27 (1),* 57-86.

Melzer, D. (2009). Writing assignments across the curriculum: authorial study of college writing. *College Composition and Communication, 61 (2),* 240-261.

Menezes, C. (2013). A comparative study of textual and rhetorical features of abstracts written by expert and novice writers. Retrieved from https://revistaapalavrada.files.wordpress.com/2014/05/1-a-comparative-study-of-textual-and-rhetorical-features-of-abstracts-written-by-expert-and-novice-writers-cilc3a9ia-alves-menezes.pdf

Mellor, A. (2010). Essay length, lexical diversity and automatic essay scoring. *Memoirs of the Osaka Institute of Technology, 55 (2),* 1-14.

Meral, C., & Ozen, G. (2003). Reading for writing. *Academic Exchange Quarterly, 7 (1)*. Retrieved from https://www.questia.com/library/journal/1G1-101943701/reading-for-writing

Meyers, A. (2013). *Longman academic writing series 5: Essays to research papers* (1st edition). Pearson Educational ESL.

Mezirow, K. (1990). *Fostering critical reflection in adulthood: A guide to transformative and emancipatory learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Minott, A. M. (2008). Valli's typology of reflection and the analysis of pre-service teachers' reflective journals. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (5),* 55-65. Retrieved from http://ro.ecu.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1502&context=ajte

Mirandor, J. (2000). A move analysis of written feedback in higher education. *RELC Journal, 31 (1),* 45-60.

Mohammadi, M., Hekmatshoar Tabari, B., & Hekmatshoar Tabari, B. (2013). The rhetorical structure and discursive features of call for papers as a genre. *International Journal of Linguistics and English Literature, 2 (4),* 1-6.

Mohsenzadeh, H. (2013). Rhetorical move structure of literature book prefaces in English and Persian. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, 4 (41),* 317-323.

Morton, F. (1999). Abstracts as authentic material or EAP Classes. *ELT Journal, 53 (3),* 177-182.

Moskovsky, C., & Alrabai, F. (2009). Intrinsic motivation in Saudi leaner of English as a foreign language. *The open Applied Linguist Journal, 2,* 1-10.

Motta-Roth, D. (1998). Discourse analysis and academic book reviews: A study of text and disciplinary cultures. In I. Fortanet, S. Postguillo, J.C. Palmer & J.f. Coll (eds.), *Genre studies in English for academic purposes. Castello: Univeristat Jaume, 1*, 29-58.

Mugumya, L. (2013). *The discourse of conflict: An appraisal analysis of newspaper genres in English and Runyan Kole-Rukiga in Uganda* (2001-2010). A dissertation presented to Stellen Bosch University, Uganda.

Mukattash, L. (1983). The problem of difficulty in foreign language learning. In E. Dahiyat and M. Ibrahim (eds.), *Papers form the first conference on the problems of teaching English language and literature at Arab universities*. University of Jordan, Jordan.

Murdoch, Y. (2000). An analysis of a Korean student's written English text. *Assignment for MA TEFL/TESL, Center for English Language Studies, University of Birmingham, UK , 1-23*, retrieved from http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/Documents/college-artslaw/cels/essays/writtendiscourse/yvette5.pdf

Nation, I.S. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Natsukari, S. (2012). Use of I in essays by Japanese EFL learners. *JALT Journal, 34(1),* 61-78.

Nesi, H. (2008). A multidimensional analysis of student writing across levels and disciplines. *Proceedings of the BAAL Annual Conference, 81-84.* Retrieved from http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/al/research/collections/bawe/papers/nesi_baal08_abstract_formatted.pdf.

Natsukari, S. (2012). Use of I in essays by Japanese EFL learners. *JALT Journal, 34 (1),* 61-78.

Nezami, S. R. A. (2012). A critical study of comprehension strategies and general problems in

reading skills faced by Arab EFL learners with special reference to Najran University in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Education, 2 (3),* 306-316.

Nazim, M., & Ahmad, J. (2012). Developing writing skills: A practical remedy for common writing problems among students of writing skill courses at Preparatory Year at Najran University, Saudi Arabia. *Language in India, 12 (3),* 348-360.

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Nwogu, K. (1997). The medical research paper: structure and functions. *English for specific purpose, 16 (2),* 119-138.

Okamura, A. (2009). Use of personal pronouns in two type of monologic academic speech. *The Economic Journal of Takasaki City University of Economics, 52 (1),* 17-26.

Okamura, A. (2011). *The use of personal pronouns in university lectures*.

Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (2006). *Introduction to academic writing: The Longman academic series* (Level 3). Pearson Longman.

Peacock, M. (1997). The effect of authentic materials on the motivation of EFL learners. *ELT Journal, 51(2),* 144-156.

Petch-Tyson, S. (1998). Reader/writer visibility in EFL persuasive writing. In Granger, S. (ed.) *Learner English on Computer (pp.* 107—118). London and New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Plack, M.M., Dricoll, M., Blissett, S., McKenna, R., & Plack, T. P. (2005). A method for assessing reflective journal writing. *Journal of Allied Health, 34 (4),* 199-208.

Plack, M. M. , Driscoll, M., Marquez, M., Cuppernull, L., Maring, J., & Greenberg, L. (2007). Assessing reflective writing on a pediatric clerkship by using a modified Bloom's Taxonomy. *Ambulatory Pediatrics, 7 (4),* 285-291.

Raims, A. (1991). Out of the woods: Emerging traditions in the teaching of writing. *TESOL Quarterly, 25 (3)*, 407-430.

Reid, J. (1990). Responding to different topic types: A quantitative analysis. In B. Kroll (eds.), *Second language writing: Issues and options*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Reid, J. M. (1993). *Teaching ESL Writing*. New Jersey: Regents.

Ren, G. (2010). An overall review of linguistic research on genre. *Review of European studies, 2 (2),* 232-235. Retrieved from http://www.ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/res/article/view/8458

Renninger, K. A. (1988). Effects of interest and noninterest in student performance with tasks of mathematical word problems and reading comprehension. In A. Krapp (chair), *Difference in student performance across subject areas as a function of interest*. Symposium conducted at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, New Orleans.

Rodriguez, R., Vazquez, A., & Guzman, N. (2011). Exploring writer identity in Mexican EFL students' academic writing. *Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura, 16 (28),* 93-115. Retrieved from https://aprendeenlinea.udea.edu.co/revistas/index.php/ikala/article/view/8002

Rosenblatt, L.M. (1978). *The reader, the text, the poem: The transactional theory of the literary work*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Ruetten, M. (2011). *Developing composition skills: Academic writing and grammar* (3rd edition). Heinle ELT.

Salmani Nodoshan, M., & Montazeran, H. (2012). The book review journal: A structural move analysis. *International journal of language studies, 6 (1),* 1-30.

Schneider, M., & Connor, V. (1990). Analyzing topical structure in ESL essays: Not all topics are equal. *SSLA, 12,* 411-427.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco. Jossey-Bass.

Seng, T. W. (2004). *Measuring practicum student teachers' reflectivity: the reflective pedagogical thinking scale*. Retrieved on Feb 15, 2013 from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED490778.pdf

Shanahan, T., & Lomax, R. (1986). An analysis and comparison of theoretical models of the reading-writing relationship. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78 (2),* 116-123.

Shanahan, T., & Lomax, R. (1988). A developmental comparison of three theoretical models of the reading-writing relationship. *Research in the Teaching of English, 22 (2)*, 196-212.

Shehzad, W. (2007). Explicit author in scientific discourse: a corpus-based study of the authors' voice. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research, 3,* 56-73.

Shen, M. (2008). Reading-writing connection for EFL college learner's literacy development. *Asian EFL Journal, 11 (1)*. Retrieved from http://120.118.219.14/dspace/bitstream/987654321/1945/1/AEJ_March_2009_master.pdf#page=89

Shokrpour, N., & Fallahzadeh, M. (2007). A survey of the students and Interns' EFL writing problems in Shiraz University of Medical Sciences. *Asian EFL journal, 9 (1),* 147-163.

Sitthitikul, P. (2014). Theoretical review of phonics instruction for struggling/beginning readers Of English. *PASAA, 48,* 113-126.

Smith, F. (1983). Reading like a writer. *Language arts, 60 (5),* 558-567.

Spack, R. (1988). Initiating ESL students into the academic discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly, 22 (1),* 29-51. DOI: 10.2307/3587060. Retrieved from http://umei004-spring13.wikispaces.com/file/view/Spack+Initiating+ESL+Students+into+the+Academic+Discourse+Community+-+How+Far+Should+We+Go.pdf

Spading, E., & Wilson, A. (2002). Demystifying reflection: A study of pedagogical strategies that encourage reflective journal writing. *Teachers College Record, 104 (7),* 1393-1421.

Sparks-Langer, G. M., Simmons, J. M., Pasch, M., & Colton, A. (1990). Reflective pedagogical thinking: How can we promote it and measure it? *Journal of Teacher Education, 41 (4),* 23-32.

Spivey, N. N., & King, J. R. (1989). Readers and writers composing from sources. *Reading Research Quarterly, 24 (1),* 7-26.

Spack, R. (1985). Literature, reading, writing and the ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 19,* 705-725.

Stapleton, P. (2001). Assessing critical thinking in the writing of Japanese university students: insights about assumptions and content familiarity. *Written Communication, 18 (4),* 506-548.

Suarez, L., & Moreno, A. (2006). *The rhetorical structure of academic journal book reviews: A cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary approach*. Retrieved from http://www.unizar.es/aelfe2006/ALEFE06/1.discourse/28..pdf.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swan, M. (1991). The textbook: Bridge or wall? In R. Boweres & C. Brumfit (eds.), *Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching* (pp.32-36). London: Macmillan Publishers Limited.

Tabatabaei, O., & Amin A. H. (2012). The effect of reading-based pre-writing activities on the

writing performance in an EFL setting. *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 2 (2),* 371-382. Doi:10.5901/jesr.2012.v2n2.371

Taggart, G. L., & Wilson, A. P. (2005). *Promoting reflective thinking in teachers: 50 action strategies.* Sage Publication Ltd. London: UK. Retrieved from http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/6681_taggart_ch_1.pdf

Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The 'I' in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing through the first person pronouns. *English for Specific Purposes, 18,* S23-S29.

Tedick, D. (1988). *The effects of topic familiarity on the writing performance of non-native writers at the graduate level* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).Ohio State University, US.https://etd.ohiolink.edu/!etd.send_file?accession=osu1249663273&disposition=inline

Thonney, T. (2013). "At first I thought… but I don't know for sure": The use of first person pronouns in the academic writing of novices. *Across the Disciplines, 10 (1),* 1-15.

Tierney, R. J., O'flahavan, J. F., & McGinley, W. (1989). The effects of reading and writing upon thinking critically. *Reading research quarterly, 24 (2),* 134-173.

Tsai, J. (2006). Connecting reading and writing in college EFL courses. *The internet TESL-Journal.* Retrieved from http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:ri-XKTLigewJ:iteslj.org/Articles/Tsai-ReadingWritingConnection.html+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk

Upton, T., & Cohen, M. (2009). An approach to corpus-based discourse analysis: The move analysis as example. *Discourse studies, 11 (5),* 585-605.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory*. Cambridge University press.

Valli, L. (1997). Listening to other voices: A description of teacher reflection in the United States. *Peabody journal of Education,* 72 (1), 67-88.

Van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum inquiry, 6,* 205-228.

Villanueva, A. (2008). *An international comparative study on English writing proficiency in two Secondary school settings*. Retrieved from http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:211250/fulltext01.pdf.

Vorenberg, A. (2011). Essay: The moral of the story: The power of narrative to inspire and sustain scholarship. *Legal Communication and rhetoric: JALWD, 8,* 257-268.

Vladimirou, D. (2007). 'I suggest that we need more research': Personal reference in linguistic journal articles. *Paper from the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistic and language Teaching (1),* 139-157.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.

Wallman, A., Lindblad, A.K., Hall, S., Lundmark, A., & Ring, L. (2008). A categorization scheme for assessing pharmacy students' levels of reflection during internships. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 72 (1),* 1-10.

Weigle, S. C. (2002). *Assessing writing* .Cambridge University Press.

Whittington, M. S., Stup, R. E., Bish, L., & Allen, E. (1997). Assessment of cognitive discourse: A study of thinking opportunities provided by professors. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 38 (1),* 46-53.

Widdowson, H. (1996). Comment: Authenticity and autonomy in ELT. *ELT Journal, 50(1),* 67-68.

Wong, F. K. , Kember, D., Chung, L. Y. F., & Yan, L. (1995). Assessing the level of student reflection from reflective journals. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 22,* 48-57.

Wyrick, J. (2008). *Steps to writing well* (10th edition). Thomson Wadsworth.

Xiaoping, J. (2011). Understanding your students: An investigation on topics of interest to Chinese EFL graduate students. *Asian EFL Journal, CEBU 51,* 4-15. Retrieved from https://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:0UYfwEddCSUJ:https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/596/teaching-articles/2011/04/understanding-your-students-an-investigation-on-topics-of-interest-to-chinese-efl-graduate-student/+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk

Yang, H. S. (2009). Rhetorical patterns in L2 writers' argumentative essays. *Fall 2009 TESOL conference, pp.*1-7.

Yeo, J., & Ting, S. (2014). Personal pronouns for student engagement in arts and science lecture introductions. *English for Specific Purposes, 34,* 26-37.

Young, D. (1999). Linguistic simplification of SL reading material: Effective instructional practice? *The Modern Language Journal, 38 (3),* 350-366.

Zainal, Z., & Mohamed Husin, S. H. (2011). *A study on the effect of reading on writing*

performance among faculty of civil engineering students. Unspecified . pp. 1-8. (Unpublished) Retrieved from http://eprints.utm.my/11872/1/A_Study_On_The_Effects_Of_Reading_On_Writing_Performance_Among_Faculty_Of_Civil_Engineering_Students.pdf

Zanin, E. (2015). The morel of the story: On narrative and ethics. *Amsterdam International Electronic Journal for Cultural Narratology*. Retrieved from http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:kSy3ege75kUJ:cf.hum.uva.nl/narratology/a11_zanin.htm+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk

Zhang, Y. (2004). A study of English writing by native Chinese freshmen: Teaching English requires the teaching of culture(s). *Asian EFL Journal, 6 (4),* 1-26.

Zhang, A. (2010). Use of cohesive ties in relation to the quality of composition by Chinese college students. *Journal of ACS, 5 (2-3),* 78-86. https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.1358

Zhang, Y. (2012). A generic analysis of 1st personal pronouns, in the international conference presentations. *International conference on Education and Management Engineering: Lecture notes in information Technology,* 16-17.

Zhen-ye, N. (2008). A genre-based analysis of English research article abstracts and the linguistic features of personal pronouns for financial Economics. *US-China Education Review, 5 (7),* 62-65.

Zughoul, M. (1987). Restructuring the English department in the third world universities: Alternative approach for the teaching of English literature. *IRAL, 25 (3),* 221-236.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Appendix A Academic and Non-academic Genres

Table A1

A Summary of Some Studies on Academic and Non-academic Genres

Super-genre	Researcher(s)	Genre	Number of moves
Academic	Nwogu (1997)	Medical research paper	11
	Bhatia (1993); Zhen-ye (2008)	Research abstract	4 7
	Bhatia (1993); Swale (1990)	Research introduction	4 4
	Swales (1990)	Research discussion section	8
	Gecikli (2013)	PhD dissertations' introductions	3
	John (2007)	PhD dissertations' results and discussions	5
	Menezes (2013)	Conference abstracts (comparing novice and experts)	2-3 (experts) 4-5 (novices)
	Mohammadi, Hekmatshoar Tabari, Hekmatshoar Tabari (2013)	Call for conference papers in Iranian context	4
	Feng & Shi (2004); Connor & Mauranen (1999); Swales (1990)	Grant proposals Grand proposal summary section Research grant proposal	10 3 10 9
	Flowerdew (2000)	Report projects	Proposing problem-solution moves
	Ding (2007)	Personal statements in application letters (successful and unsuccessful applications)	5
	Lieungnapar & Todd (2011); Hyland &Tse (2009)	Journal description	3 (top-down) 5 (bottom-up) 5
	Mohsenzadeh (2013)	Literature book prefaces in English and Persian	6 (in English) 8 (in Persian)
	Cacchiani (2007); Motta-Roth (1998); Salmani Nodoshan & Montazeran (2012)	Book reviews Book reviews (BR) written by native, ESL and EFL writers	5 4 4

	Suarez & Moreno (2006)	Academic journal book reviews (Spanish and English writers, history and law)	4
	Mirandor (2000)	Reader (teacher) feedback	
	Hyland (1990) Yang (2009)	Argumentative essays	12 (3 sections) 3
	Afful (2010); Henry & Roseberry (1997); Kusel (1992)	Introductions and conclusions of argumentative essays (multi-disciplinary; multi-genre studies)	3 (introductions) 3 (introductions), 2 (conclusions) 3 (introductions) 3 (conclusions)
	Hüttner (2010)	Student research paper conclusions	6
Non-academic	Bhatia (1993)	Legal documents' characteristics	
	Bhatia (1993) Crossley (2008)	Job applications/ cover letter	7 8
	Bhatia (1993)	Sale promotion letters	7
	Upton & Cohen (2009)	Birthmother letters	10
	Ghaemi & Sheibani (2014)	Patient information leaflet	22 (17 sections)
	Katajamaki & Koskela (2006)	Newspaper editorials in 3 different languages	3
	Cacchiani (2007)	Book blurbs	4

APPENDIX B

Rhetorical Functions of Personal Pronouns

Table B1

A Summary of Some Studies on the Discourse Functions of 'I'

Tang and John (1999)	Hyland (2002)	Clark and Ivanič (1997, in Rodriguez et al, 2011)	Thonney (2013)	Natsukari (2012)
I as ----- Representative (we) - Guide - Architect - Re-counter - Opinion-holder - Originator of ideas	I for ------ - Stating a purpose - Explaining a procedure - Stating results - Expressing self-benefits - Elaborating an argument	I for ------ - Structuring the essay - Presenting personal experience - Making a statement of value or belief	I for ----- - Making a claim - Describing a procedure - Showing uncertainty - Showing personal benefits or personal response - Showing an understanding - Announcing a topic/ purpose - Addressing the reader	I for------ - Personal matters (personal identity, experiences, ability, feeling, hopes) - Opinions (to argue an opinion or express their feeling about an issue) - Organizing the text - Usage in conversation (indirect quotations)

Table B2

A Summary of Some Studies on the Functions of 'We' in Academic Writing

Harwood (2005)	Fortanet (2004)	Hyland (2001, 2002)	Chang (2014)	Kuo (1999)
'We' is used to ---	'We' is used to--	'We' is used to ----	'We' is used to-	'We' is used to---
- show novelty of the writer's work - organize the text - show positive or negative politeness - persuade readers - describe methodology - guide the flow of discussion - identify further research/concern	- represent all or specific group of people -act as a hedging device to protect writers from the questioning and opinions of their discourse community members	- create group solidarity and sense of communality - direct readers in an argument or 'positioning' them - show politeness - refer to shared knowledge - decrease potential disfavor - act as a hedging device to avoid complete commitment to a proposition	- establish solidarity - tone down directives - present a general claim - organize the text	- explain what was done - propose a theory - state a goal or purpose - show results/ findings - justify a proposition - hedge a proposition - assume shared knowledge/goals/beliefs - show commitment or contribution to research - compare approaches - seek agreement - give a reason or discuss necessity - express a wish or expectation (p. 130).

Table B3

A Summary of Some Studies on the Functions of 'You' in Academic Writing and Speeches

Hyland (2001, 2005)	Yeo & Ting (2014)	De Hoop & Hogeweg (2014)	Okamura (2009)
'You' is used to-----	'You' is used to-----	'You' is used to---	'You' is used to-----
- engage the reader - persuade - emphasize their membership in the group or solidarity - orient readers towards writer's argument - raise readers' interest (by questions)	- present a general truth or opinion - activate audience's prior knowledge - give instructions or announcements - share experiences - direct students' attention - explain the subject matter	- present a general truth or opinion - raise the reader's feeling of empathy or identification	- involve students - build a rapport with the audiences, - put out a disfavor

Appendix C

The Instruction Sheet on the Reader Response Assignment

ENGL212 (Advanced Academic Reading and Vocabulary)

Reader Response Journal Assignment
(Read, Think, Reflect, and Write)

Fall 2012

Dear students,
The following is a short explanation about the reader response assignment that you are required to do this semester.

What is the assignment? You are expected to read a passage of your interest (from any resources). Then you need to 1) write a summary of it (one paragraph), and 2) write your reflection on the topic just read (as long as you want).

What is a reflective response? You should focus on a key idea from the reading, explaining, exploring or/and expanding it more. You might relate the idea to your own experiences, attitudes, or observations.

Why should you reflect? Reflection is a form of personal response to an experience, situation or new information. At the core of reflective thinking is YOU and what you bring to a reading situation (your prior knowledge, formal information, and how you build on it). Reflecting improves your ability to read critically, and analyze and synthesize the reading passages. Writing about the ideas helps you to have a better grasp of them by clarifying your own understanding. The process of thinking and writing reflectively strengthens your critical thinking skills. It helps you to think about how that reading material applies to you and relates to your life, or why it is interesting to you or confuses you. It helps you to think in more details to analyze and evaluate the reading texts, write about what you have learned, what you need to learn, and what conclusion you might draw from it. It makes you become an active learner and a reflective practitioner. It makes you think about possibilities, to hypothesize and suggest solutions. You can compare and contrast what you just learned with what you already know.

How many assignments should you do?
You are expected to read 5 different reading texts throughout the semester (1 every 3 weeks). After each reading, you need to write a reflective response and submit it to your instructor. You are required to submit a printout of the passage you read along with your response.

When should you submit the assignments?
The reader responses need to be submitted in weeks 3, 6, 9, 12 and 15.

How are the assignments assessed?
The mark you gain for submitting your responses will be considered as a part of your attendance and participation mark for the course.

What should be included in the writing?
- Your first and last name

- The date
- The source of the information (name of the book/journal/magazine, name(s) of the author(s), the full internet site address for online resources with the name of the author if possible)
- The title of the reading passage
- A summary of the reading text
- The response paper along with a print of the original reading text

Consider the following in your writing:

- Use full sentences
- Pay attention to basic grammar and punctuation rules.
- Take time to write carefully (not last minute writing).
- Reflect on what you learned from the reading

Appendix D

Samples of Original Reading Texts of Different Topic Categories Chosen by Students

1. Education

*"The **Educational Benefits** of Stories for Children*

*Stories are the transference of ideas from one person to another. Children's stories usually have a **teaching** element to them that benefit the children in a number of ways. One of the biggest **educational** benefits of children's stories doubles as an emotional benefit as well. Stories can **teach** children different healthy coping mechanisms by taking adult concepts such as divorce, abuse, or death and **presenting** them in a way that neutralizes their fear factor.*

*In much the same way, stories for children can be used to help children deal with irrational fears, which are often figments of the child's imagination. A commonly addressed theme of children's stories that highlights this point is the infamous Monster Under the Bed theme. In these children's stories the authors usually **demonstrate** to their readers **how to** confront fears head on—a **life lesson** that is easily transferable. Meanwhile, the illustrators **present** the "scary things" in a way that is more approachable. Once the fear factor of a situation is neutralized to a child, he is able to better **process** the situation and expedite his recovery.*

*There is a domino effect that exists when a child **is read to** from a young age. When an adult **reads** to a child consistently, that child becomes more **interested in reading** books and stories on his own, improving his **literacy**. You can also find a **tutor** for your child to ensure they're ahead of the game. Not only does **reading** to children help them to become **better readers**, it also helps them to become **better story tellers**. One reason for this phenomenon is the fact that **reading** helps **expand vocabulary**.*

*A child with an **enhanced vocabulary** can usually **express** his ideas in a clearer and more concise way than a child with a **limited vocabulary**. When they are relaying a story, children with **extensive vocabularies** have the ability to make the story come alive by painting a picture with their **words**. A second reason why children who read frequently make **better story tellers***

*is because **reading develops imagination**, and imaginative children almost always have the ability to relay the most boring situations in exciting ways.*
*Another very important theme that children's stories tend to relay is the idea of morality. Many writers have taken the simple straight-forward **concept**s presented in Aesop's Fables, tweaked them slightly, and **re-presented** them in a form appropriate for children. In this way, the stories are used to **showcase** principles like integrity and wisdom in a way that's easy for children to digest.*" (PM.12.D)
Source: http://lightupyourbrain.com/resources/related-articles/the-educational-benefits-of-stories-for-children/

This text is about the advantages of reading stories to children. It mentions 4 benefits for reading stories, which are emotional support, psychological support (dealing with irrational fear), teaching literacy skills (reading and vocabulary), and teaching morality. So, all of these benefits are related to education of children in different aspects. Use of linguistic devices (nouns, adjectives, verbs) that are boldfaced also helped in determining the categorization of this text. For example, words such as educational benefits, teaching, presenting, life lesson, reading, expand vocabulary, literacy signal what category the topic falls under, i.e. *Education*.

2. Health

*"What Is **Corona Virus**?*

***Corona viruses** are a group of **viruses** that **infect** the **respiratory tract** of both humans and animals. Some **corona viruses** affect the **digestive system**. The **virus** has a crown-like projection on its surface, which is how it got its name. There are many different **species of the virus**. Human **corona virus** was discovered in 1965 and accounts for 10 percent to 30 percent of **common colds**. It **affects** all age groups and is **most common** during the winter and early spring. In young children and older people, **human corona virus** can **affect** the **lower respiratory tract** as well. Many people **get corona virus** for a second time within four months after **having** it the first time. **Scientists** believe this is because the **antibodies** created **to fight the corona virus** only **protect** a person for four months. In addition, there are many different types of **human corona virus** and the **antibodies** from one type will **not protect** you from another type. The **incubation period of the virus** -- meaning the time it is **in the body** before **symptoms** appear -- is usually*

*two to four days, and the **infection** caused by **human corona virus** is usually **mild**. A relatively small amount of information is known about **human corona viruses** because most of them do not grow in **cultured cells**, making it difficult to study them.*

*The **SARS outbreak** in 2002 was believed to be caused by a new type of **corona virus** that was similar to the one that **affects** cats. Due to its **contagious nature**, **SARS** became a **world epidemic**, spreading to 32 countries and **infecting** 8,459 people. Many of the people who **contracted SARS** also **developed pneumonia**, and over 800 people **died as a result of SARS**."*

(PN.28.D)

Source: **http://health.howstuffworks.com/diseases-conditions/respiratory/corona-virus.htm**

This topic is about the corona virus and how it infects a person and some other information about its types and duration. Towards the end, it mentions one type of this virus which is SARS and gives some statistics about it. Besides the sentence level analysis, the linguistic cues used also are important in determining the category this text belongs to. Words such as human corona virus, lower respiratory tract, getting and having the virus, infection, contagious, cultured cells and more as highlighted all signal that this topic related to the topic of *Health* and the subtopic of defining and describing a disease/medical condition.

3. Literature

''Love What You Have

*There **was** a 8 year old **girl**. **One day while** returning from school with **her mum**, **she saw** a wonderful **barbie doll**, on the shelf of a toy shop. **The barbie was** designed and packed perfectly. **She insisted her mum** to buy it, but **her mum** was having a cash crunch and 50 dollar for **the doll was** bit too much to afford as **her husband** was separated and had left and all **she** was using was **her savings** to live their life.*

*Now **each day after her school while coming back with her mum** the **gal cried** for that **toy** and all **her mum** could say was **next month**. **Days passed;** this continued, **mum** got fed up and **slapped her daughter** for the first time to forget about that **toy**, and **she** get a better one (obviously low cost), but **the kid was** very stubborn, **she wanted that** only.*

Finally *it was* ***month of winter when her mum found*** *a job which* ***she*** *had to do at home on* ***her*** *spare time* ***at night after*** *making* ***her daughter*** *sleep, the job was to stitch cloth.* ***Finally she*** *could have extra money, now* ***she was*** *bit relaxed. It was* ***Monday morning, when*** *like every school off* ***she went*** *to bring* ***her daughter****, but this time* ***she didn't go*** *alone,* ***she bought*** *the* ***barbie toy*** *for* ***her****.* ***The kid was*** *glad to see that,* ***hugged her mum****.* ***She*** *was in joy.*

Each day the kid played with her doll*, playing with* ***it,*** *making* ***the barbie*** *bath, comb hair, making her put fancy dress(which* ***she*** *got with* ***the toy****).* ***Days passed****, now* ***she*** *a year older, now* ***the barbie*** *did not kept so much importance,* ***while playing, she snatched*** *d hair* ***broke her 1 hand****, etc.* ***after all she got bored*** *with* ***that, after all the barbie*** *lost importance.*

Finally days passed, the kid grew up, she was married *and in* ***her*** *thirties, and* ***come*** *to visit* ***her old mum****.* ***after lunch her mum took her to her room*** *where* ***she*** *grew up,* ***she was*** *cherishing* ***old times*** *with* ***her mum, suddenly she noticed, her old toy*** *box,* ***as she opened she saw and took out a barbie, the doll*** *without one hand, hair was torn off, and bit damaged. Looking at* ***that her mum*** *flashed back d* ***story*** *that how* ***she managed*** *to buy* ***that****, now the* ***gal was*** *more matured and made* ***her*** *feel d importance of* ***that doll*** *again,* ***she was*** *into tears, that half broken n damaged* ***doll*** *was so precious now,* ***she thought*** *how could* ***she*** *do this with* ***that doll****, for which* ***she cried every day****, and for which* ***mum*** *had to pay* ***her hard earned money, she*** *hoped that if* ***her doll*** *was in perfect shape* ***she*** *cud even gifted 2* ***her*** *kid, after all it was* ***her memories****, now was now very precious.*

She took the doll *along with* ***her****, and* ***kept it in her house, after she kept that in her shelf****, what* ***she realized*** *was that how we human being are so immature, what we want we want and we get, we forget its importance, and when we finally lose it, we are the one who suffer for it.*

Moral of the Story*-close your eyes, take a sec, and realize, maybe you are forgetting someone importance just because you got or have that. So it is never late, love what you have got and never let the importance go, because someday it is you who will realize how much you have cried to get it and at last suffer for your mistake for losing it.*" (PN.14.B)

Source: http://yourstoryclub.com/short-stories-for-kids/kids-moral-short-story-love-what-you-have/

This text is not a typical literature work like a novel or a short story; however, it has the elements of a narrative (characters, setting, plot, time) and therefore was considered under the *Literature* category. The highlighted words among which are those referring to the characters (mum, the daughter and the Barbie doll), the actions (snatched, bought, kept, took….), the time expressions (one day, after that, while, when, each day…), the setting (home, school,…) and the verb tenses (mostly past and past continuous) all indicate that a story is being told.

4. Psychology

''10 Steps to Success and Happiness

1) One's dealings with other people *should never be guided by cold reason alone, but* ***one should*** *always consider* ***their frame of mind****, that is,* ***their character traits****.*

2) Everyone thinks *he excels at something more than you, and probably he/she is right.* ***Agree*** *with him, and he/she will* ***love*** *you. (Remember what is said in the Ramban's letter: "If you are wiser than he, remember that he is more righteous than you, for he sins by mistake while you sin knowingly…")*

3) Everyone is more interested in his own needs *than in you; therefore,* ***draw his attention*** *to the point where your interests and his coincide.*

4) Don't try *only to get a person to do something, but* ***try to get him*** *to want to do it, and to be* ***happy*** *doing it.*

5) Guard against getting into bitter arguments with your friends*, for this* ***will distance and separate*** *you from them.*

6) Don't talk about yourself *so much.* ***Talk with your friend about him****, and he* ***will be interested in*** *hearing you. (****Most people's favorite word*** *is "I," and they find nothing more splendid than their own name.)*

7) Listen to what others say*,* ***make an effort to remember their names*** *and details about them, and they* ***will love*** *you.*

8) Don't criticize your friend openly*; it* ***will only make him more obstinate****. Criminals, even the worst murderers, never admit their guilt in their hearts.*

9) *When you speak with your friend,* ***admit the truth****, otherwise he* ***will hate you*** *- and rightly so.*

10) *Remember what the best doctors say, that important as it is to understand the illness, it is* ***more important to understand the patient****, because a large part of every illness, and sometimes the entire illness, comes from the* ***patient's state of mind****. If you can* ***correct this by showing him plenty of love*** *and fellowship, the illness* ***will pass****.*

One *who follows these rules will eventually find it easy to rise above his instinctive reactions, because he has accustomed himself to look at things from his* ***fellow man's point of view****."* (PN.11.C)

Source: http://www.simpletoremember.com/jewish/blog/10-steps-to-success-happiness/

The steps mentioned above give instructions about how to be successful and happy. It gives tips on how to behave in certain circumstances in order to get what you want and be happy with it. These issues, success and happiness, are usually in the realm of behavioral sciences. Therefore, it was decided to put this text in the category of *Psychology*. The linguistic cues in form of imperative sentences instructing what to do or not to do (listen, admit, correct, don't talk, don't try) and the predicted results (will hate you, will make him obstinate, will love you, will pass, …), the use of second person pronoun singular (you-audience), and some technical words (frame of mind, state of mind) all further indicate that it is a text that focuses on people's behavior towards each other.

5. Society

"The Death of Poetry

The ***consensus*** *seems to be that* ***poetry*** *is* ***dead****.* ***It*** *was great in* ***its time****, but* ***its time*** *is* ***past****. Who reads* ***poetry*** *now, for God's sake? No music, no video clips, no* ***pin-up poets*** *- absolutely nothing sexy about* ***poetry*** *whatsoever.*

So what ***killed poetry****? Undoubtedly one of the* ***culprits*** *was* ***pop****, although this was just one aspect of an* ***entertainment industry*** *whose* ***influence*** *went so deep that it managed to ensure that* ***no one*** *any longer would have an* ***ear for poetry****.*

In ***its day poetry*** *was* ***kept alive*** *by a certain sensibility that* ***many people*** *in the* ***middle and upper classes*** *had. These were* ***people who could travel out into the countryside*** *and* ***just sit and listen to the birds singing and the wind gently whistling*** *through the leaves - or* ***marvel***

at the ever-changing shapes of the passing clouds. ***They*** *were* ***people who could turn their backs*** *on the chatter of* ***urban life*** *for a time and* ***contemplate*** *something that seemed grander or more profound or more uplifting - something poetic.*

The people *who grew up to be like this were* ***people who were familiar with silence****.* ***Houses*** *a hundred years ago must have been relatively* ***quiet places*** *-* ***places*** *conducive to* ***meditating*** *upon the shivering little bird on the bare branch of the tree* ***outside*** *in the bleak* ***midwinter evening****. After all,* ***what else was there*** *to do? If you wanted music you would have to play an instrument. If you* ***wanted chatter*** *you would have to* ***invite people*** *over and start chatting. Added to this was* ***a culture centered on books****.* ***Long before*** *it was possible to* ***cheaply reproduce and widely distribute*** *either images or sounds, the* ***printing press*** *had made it possible for* ***a culture*** *to spring up which revolved around the written word.*

Things have changed*.* ***People grow up with a constant supply of mass-produced music and chat and TV images*** *and noise - a* ***wall of sound*** *keeping almost everything else out. The* ***sheer extent of the exposure*** *creates****, in many people****, a* ***psychological need*** *to keep the music and the chatter and the noise going. The* ***place seems empty*** *and* ***time seems to pass in a deathly way*** *without it.* ***When no one*** *any longer was able to take pleasure in silence* ***there ceased to be an audience*** *for* ***poetry*** *and* ***the art form*** *we had known for some 3,000 years* ***died****.*

Since ***it*** *is* ***dead*** *why don't we just leave it to* ***rot in its grave****? But some of us believe that we should try to* ***keep alive the memory****, at least, of what once was. We can still read the* ***old poems*** *there on the yellowing paper even though* ***the audience*** *for whom they were intended* ***has largely disappeared****."* (PM.15.A)

Source: http://fullspate.digitalcounterrevolution.co.uk/archive/poetry1.html

Although this text has a title which might make it as belonging to the category of *Literature*, when read thoroughly it becomes clear that the purpose of the author is to highlight the societal changes and people's life style. In fact, the author is using this topic, poetry, to show the changes that have happened in societies and impacted people's lives, one of which is the status of poetry. So the dominant topic here is the societal changes and their effects, not the poetry per se. The linguistic cues helping to determine this are words such as consensus, its time, passed, many people (with adjective clauses describing them), middle and upper class

people, mass-produced music and chat, houses, places, a culture centered on books and so on. As a result, this text was categorized under the category of *Society*.

6. Environment

*"**Water***

***Water** is a **resource** of prime importance. We need **water** for **irrigation, industries, transport, drinking, bathing** and several other purposes in **everyday life**. **Life on the earth** would not have been **evolved** without **water. Water** has become indispensable for the **disposal of urban sewage and dirt**. **Water** is essential for the very **existence of life on the globe**. Without **water** we cannot **survive**. **Agriculture** is the major **source of food** for us. **Water** is essential for **raising food crops**. **Fish** which make up **a large chunk of our food** and their existence depends on **water**. **Forests** which provide us numerous things and **keep our ecological balance intact** also need **water**. **Water** is an excellent and cheap **resource** for **generating hydroelectricity**. It is **a renewable and pollution-free source of energy**, essential for **modern comfortable living**. Therefore, **water** is indispensable in **our day to day life**."* (PM.22.D)

Source: http://www.preservearticles.com/201104215585/short-paragraph-on-water.html

The main theme of this text is water and what role it plays in our life. It mentions the role of water in what we find in our environment: sewage systems, agriculture, sea life, forests and others. It shows that this topic was related to *Environment* and was not just a pure science topic describing water and its components. The linguistic cues are words like life on earth, existence of life on the globe, survive, disposal of urban sewage and dirt, raising food crops, and ecological balance.

APPENDIX E

Rhetorical Moves in Student Responses

Table E1

Rhetorical Structure of Reader Response in Student Texts

Move	Step	Example
Introduction (introducing the topic)	1.Announcing the topic in general terms	*"Each country has their own way of celebrating the birthday."* (PM.41.C)
	2. Announcing one's agreement/disagreement (with the author's idea or with the author's style of writing or organization of the text)	*"I totally agree with the writer that we should learn more than one language since childhood."* (PN.3.C)
	3. Announcing one's support of the reading content	"*I like this article because it shows the benefits of reading to children."* (PM. 22.B)
	4.Presenting a philosophical view of the topic	*"Being thankful for the things that you have could lead to a very good fortune, but being selfish could lead to very bad consequences."* (PN.9.C)
	5. Making a specific connection to oneself, one's culture, or other specific groups	*"In my opinion, when I read any books- specially literal novels, I feel that I am living another life besides my own life."* (PM.23.D)
Argument (developing the topic)	1. Presenting the author's ideas and mainly keeping the original text's genre	*"There are a great many benefits for reading books. Children who are successful reader tend to exhibit progressive social he daily practice of reading. Reading books can develop a person's comprehension by learning new words."* (PN.2.B)
	2. Presenting the author's ideas but showing some degree of writer involvement (opinion, prior factual or world knowledge)	"*We may be unaware of how much we are influenced by them [technology] on a daily bases. But in situations like these we grasp their full impact. While it proved evidence that he did lose everything and had friends protecting his back, it hindered the police's negotiations indicating that it could be a blessing and a curse at the same time which leaves the decision to us on how to use them." (*PM.10.B)
	3. Presenting one's world knowledge and interpretational skills and offering advice about life	"*If you follow the instruction in these article you will have an efficient management of time in all aspects of life such as the work, health, professional and religion. Moreover, I think you will decrease the anxiety and dispersion of thought while you do your tasks."* (PN.34.A)
	4. Making a connection to one's or others' personal experiences as the main argument or as a support for the author's ideas	*"Reading books gives me the summary of what the life is going to be and how I can deal with it. Reading books teach us how we can deal with any difficulty may we face. Reading books give the person who read a background of life instead of starting his or her life form the zero, reading books increase our knowledge about*

		anything." (PM.23.D)
Conclusion	1.Text-driven *Based on the ideas of the text (Summarizing, restating)*	*"In conclusion, reading books give us the fun and knowledge."* (PM.23.D) *Summarizing* *"Stories are really helpful way to the children. ……. . The stories are very helpful for child educational."* (PM.21.D) *Restating*
	2. Writer-driven *Based on the writer's interpretation and opinion (wishing, opinion, advising, warning, suggestion, rhetoric result, unexpected result, prediction, evaluation)*	*"Now I hope that I have a second chance to enroll again in a personal training program."* (PN.57.C) *Wishing* *"That's why I rather depend on pills than force myself to eat something I don't' like."* (PM.60.B) *Opinion* "*More importantly, they should keep in mind that their life is more important than their food desires."* (PM. 42.C) *Advising/suggesting* *"I think parents should be more careful about them because if they didn't what their kids they won't have a good generation."* (PM.19.D) *Warning* " People's life should not be priced." (PM.47.B) *Rhetoric* *"As a result, I did my best and I surprised my friends and teachers."* (PM.13.A) *Result* *"To conclude, even though in Islam there is no such thing as birthday celebration, some people in Saudi Arabia celebrate their birthdays*." (PM.41.C) *Unexpected result* *"I think if the government put strong law to prevent smoking the smoker will stop smoke easily."* (PN.60.B) *Prediction* *"So it's such a really helpful story we can learn from it a lot of good things."* (PN.36.C) *Evaluation*

APPENDIX F*

Sentence Patterns of the Introductory Steps

*(A more detailed version of the tables are available on request).

Table F1

Sentence Patterns Used in the 'General Statement' Step

Patterns	Example: Pre-nursing texts	Example: Pre-med texts
a) noun/noun phrase [topic] + copula verb+ noun phrase	*"Coffee is one of the most traded agricultural commodities in the world."* (PN.2.C) *"Smoking is a very bad habit."* (PN.26.D) *"Laugh is the best medicine for most conditions."* (PN.32.D)	*"One of the essential organs in the body is the brain."* (PM.35.D) *"Decades ago, transplanting organs from one body to another was just a fantasy dream."* (PM. 5.E)
b) noun/noun phrase [topic]+ verb +noun/noun phrase/adj +conj(*and, because)*+ noun/verb+ noun/noun phrase	*"Renal failure has several causes and vary from a person to another."* (PN.2.E) *"TV is the most important device in our lives to identify (news-science-politics-religion) and also enjoy movies, serials and programs."* (PN.49.E)	*"Vaccination is widely available and becomes a part of the regular health program in almost all industrial countries."* (PM.2.C) *"Computers have widely contribute din all fields of life including health."* (PM.2.D)
c) noun/noun phrase [topic]+verb+ noun + noun phrase *Pre-med c) noun/noun phrase [topic]+verb+/ verbal/adjective (+ prepositional phrases/verbal+ noun phrase)	*"Reading supply the mind by a huge amount of information."* (PN.5.C) *"Smoking can cause cancer and other illnesses."* (PN.5.E)	*"The potential and the incredible impacts of stem cell research made huge advances in the field of medicine."* (PM. 26.B) *"Each country has their ways of celebrating the birthday." (PM.41.C)*
d) noun/noun phrase [topic]+verb+ adjective (+ prepositional phrases/verbals)	*"Smoking is very dangerous."* (PN.47.E) *"Vitamin A is essential for growing, immunity, and reproduction."* (PN.51.C)	*"Nowadays, creativity is important to leave a mark in your job."* (PM.19.D) *"For decades, spanking a child was considered totally acceptable."* (PM. 30.D)
e) noun/noun phrase [topic] +verb +noun +adjectival clause/phrase *Pre-med e) noun/noun phrase [topic] +verb +noun/noun phrase +adjectival	*"Friendship is a relationship needed for everyone."* (PN.1.A) *"Skin cancer is a disease which affect large number of people around the world*." (PN.47.D)	*"Chess has always had an image problem, being seen as a game for brains and people with already high IQs."* (PM.30.E) *"Stuttering is a speech disorder of verbal fluency which is occasionally present in patients with Parkinson's Disease."* (PM. 31.D)

clause/phrase		
f) it + copula verb+ adjective+ verbal ------ *Pre-med f) <u>noun/noun phrase+ verb+ noun+/verbal---</u>	*"It is important to warm your body before the race."* (PN.39.D)	*"Many factors lead students to cram before an exam."* (PM.42.D) *"The key to staying healthy is eating the right food."* (PM.2.E)
g) <u>there+ copula verb+ noun+ noun phrase</u>	*"There are such story for the one stranger that they can helping for human being."* (PN.26.E)	*"There is a relationship between health and exercising."* (PM.41.D) *"There are many causes of skin cancer around us and in our environment."* (PM.54.B)
h) <u>noun/noun phrase +adjectival clause + verb +noun/noun phrase</u>	_____	*"Individuals who stutter face such social difficulties."* (PM.40.E)
i) noun/noun phrase+ verb+ noun clause	_____	*"This woman believed that she was physically ill and waited for the doctor for 40 years."* (PM.9.C) *"They always say prevention is better than cure."* (PM.9.E)

*These patterns with the underlined parts were seen only in the texts of the pre-med group.

Table F1.1

Sentence Patterns of the 'General Statement' Step and Their Frequency in Texts of Different Levels of Cognition

	Pre-nursing					Pre-med				
Frequency of use in each cognitive level→ Patterns↓	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4		Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total
a) noun/noun phrase [topic] + copula verb+ noun phrase	4	2	0	0		4	11	9	2	32
b) noun/noun phrase [topic]+ verb +noun/noun phrase/adj +conj(and, because)+ noun/verb+ noun/noun phrase	3	0	0	0		0	2	0	0	5
c) noun/noun phrase [topic]+verb+ noun + noun phrase *Pre-med c) noun/noun phrase [topic]+verb+/ verbal/adjective (+ prepositional phrases/verbal+ noun phrase)	4	2	0	0		1	11	4	0	22
d) noun/noun phrase [topic]+verb+ adjective (+ prepositional phrases/verbals)	3	2	1	0		2	3	0	1	12
e) noun/noun phrase [topic] +verb +noun +adjectival clause/phrase *Pre-med e) noun/noun phrase [topic] +verb +noun/noun phrase +adjectival clause/phrase	1	1	1	0		1	5	1	0	10
f) it + copula verb+ adjective+ verbal ------	2	0	0	0		3	5	1	0	11

*Pre-med f) noun/noun phrase+ verb+ noun+/verbal---									
g) there+ copula verb+ noun+ noun phrase	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
h) noun/noun phrase +adjectival clause + verb +noun/noun phrase	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
i) noun/noun phrase+ verb+ noun clause	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Total 27 PN, 72 PM (% is based on each group's total no.) Grand total 99	18 (66.6%)	7 (26%)	2 (7.4%)	0	11 (15.2%)	43 59.7%)	15 (20.8%)	3 (4%)	

Table F2

Sentence Patterns Used in the 'Taking a Side: Agreeing/Disagreeing with the Author on the Content or the Writing Style' Step

Patterns	Example: Pre-nursing texts	Example: Pre-med texts
Agreeing		
a) I agree with [+ noun phrase/prepositional phrase] +noun clause-------	*"I agree with what the author wrote."* (PN.1.D) *"I agree with the author when he said 'time is said to be eternal' because it is true and time is endless."* (PN.59.E)	*"In response to the article, I agree with the writer that the social media coverage of the Arab spring has contributed in spreading the movement to many countries."* (PM. 27.C) *"In response to the article, I agree with the author that medical students do develop a form of anxiety."* (PM.27.B)
b) I agree with +noun phrase/[+prepositional phrase]+prepositional phrase [topic]/noun clause [topic]	*"I agree with Kirti Daga about the importance of friend to all of us."* (PN.7.E) *"I totally agree with the writer in his point of views and with the fact about Muslims' deep love and admiration for Prophet Mohammed."* (PN.58.D)	*"I agree with the article's author about losing weight."* (PM.44.A) *"I agree with the writer especially on the second reason."* (PM.53.E)
c) [In my opinion, for my part], I agree +prepositional phrase+ prepositional phrase [topic]	*"In my opinion, I agree with him about the advantages and disadvantages for studying abroad."* (PN.58.B) *"I agree with the author about the concept of respect."* (PN.59.A)	*"Responding to the previous article, I completely agree with the idea of moving after retirement."* (PM. 40.A) *"I agree with the author that these countries should not make selling laptops their priority, and instead think about other ways to help these children to have a better life."* (PM.19.C)
d) [In my opinion], noun clause/noun phrase + verb + adj. [+ conj. +------)	*"The writer was right when he said that we should be honest and he have explained what does dishonesty."* (34.B)	*"In my opinion, what the author mentioned in the paragraph is completely true, because mobile phones have various benefits but also have as much of drawbacks."* (PM.4.E)
e) Noun phrase +verb+	*"Firstly, I liked the flow that the*	*"The author talked about a*

prepositional phrase[+ adjective clause/noun clause]/+subordinator (since, because)	*writer make in the paragraph."* (PN.23.C)	*serious issue which is becoming widely spread."* (PM.16.B) *"In this essay, the author talked about leadership since it is very important specially for working in groups to succeed."* (PM.16.D)
Disagreeing		
a) I + verb + prepositional phrase	*"First of all, I am against plastic surgery."* (PN.28.E) *"I am against transgender process because it change our identify."* (PN.27.E)	*"I disagree with Terry Hall in his opinion about smoking."* (PM.15.D)
b) use of conjunctions to show contrast (author's and student's)	*"In my opinion, women's jackets even if it has many colors and styles but at the end it is the same."* (PN.8.B)	*"It is great if the children start to develop an interest in sport but it is also does not mean that they are going to be professional athlete in it."* (PM.19.E)
c) use of negative verb and bringing a reason		*"I don't like the way the author wrote because he gives a lot of unnecessary information."* (PM.45.A)
d) use of adverbs/adverb clauses, adjectives and questions to signify disagreement	*"Daniels admits that his description is exaggerated; therefore, I disagree with him."* (PN.3.D) *"When I read the previous story it was clear for me that she made it up."* (PN.45.D)	*"Who set up the standards of beauty anyway?"* (PM.2.A) *"Firstly, the truthfulness of this story is rather suspicious."* (PM.37.E)

Table F2.1

Sentence Patterns of the 'Taking a Side: Agreeing/Disagreeing with the Author on the Content or the Writing Style' Step in Texts of Different Cognitive Levels

	Pre-nursing				Pre-med				Total
Frequency of use in each cognitive level→ Patterns↓	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
Agreeing									
a) I agree with [+ noun phrase/prepositional phrase] +noun clause-------	1	1	2	1	0	3	3	0	11
b) I agree with +noun phrase/[+prepositional phrase]+prepositional phrase [topic]/noun clause [topic]	1	5	1	1	0	0	2	0	11
c) [In my opinion, for my part], I agree +prepositional phrase+ prepositional phrase [topic]	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	5
d) [In my opinion], noun clause/noun phrase + verb + adj. [+ conj. +------)	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3
e) Noun phrase +verb+ prepositional phrase[+ adjective clause/noun clause]/+subordinator (since, because)	1	0	0	0	3	6	2	0	12
Disagreeing									

a) I + verb + prepositional phrase	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2
b) use of conjunctions to show contrast (author's and student's)	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	4
c) use of negative verb and bringing a reason	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
d) use of adverbs/adverb clauses, adjectives and questions to signify disagreement	0	1	2	0	0	1	3	1	8
Total PN 25, PM 33 (% is based on each group's total no.) Grand total 58	6 (24 %)	9 (36 %)	7 (28 %)	3 (12 %)	4 (12 %)	16 (48. 4%)	12 36. 3%)	1 (3 %)	

Table F3

Sentence Patterns Used in the 'Taking Sides: Supporting or Rejecting the Message of the Reading Text' Step

Patterns	Example: Pre-nursing	Example: Pre-med
a)[In my opinion]noun/noun phrase [topic]+verb+ noun phrase [+ adjectival clause]	*"In my opinion, the pancreatic cancer is a very critical disease that may cause death and does not have symptoms at earlier stages."* (PN.6.E) *"This biography is an example of how children get affected since childhood."* (PN.3.E)	*"Stress is a normal situation that could happen in our daily life."* (PM. 7.E) *"Dr. N.Z's gel can be a magical medicine that can recover brain injuries completely."* (PM. 15.E)
b) [In my opinions/I think] noun/pronoun + cupola verb+ adj/noun/noun phrase+ conj./subordinator/adjective clause	*"I think it's very important for people to know that words can affect the brain."* (PN.2.A) *"The article is good because it talked about something important in our life."* (PN.6.D)	*"From my point of view, I think choosing your college major is a pretty easy thing to do if you have looked at your desire, abilities, and career opportunities."* (PM.48.A) *"Obviously, the dangers of microwave radiation are very real."* (PM.1.C)
c) [In my opinion/I think] noun/noun phrase + verb+ verbal [+ ----]	*"In my opinion, this story is just to remember us to care about our family and we shouldn't let the time slip us from them."* (PN.17.E)	*"In human's battle against cancer, scientists have been trying to analyze various facts that can lead them to better understanding of the disease."* (PM.36.E) *"People need to be paying attention during the critical lower altitude portions of the flight, which are takeoff and landing."* (PM. 42.E)
d) [My opinion/ I think/noun/noun phrase] copula verb/other verbs+ noun clause *Pre-med d) [My opinion/ I think]/noun phrase + copula verb/other verbs+ noun clause	*"My opinion in the story is that it holds so many useful meanings and moralities in our lives. (PN.36.E)* *"I agree that healthy life style is so important to live a great life."* (PM.38.D)	*"Recent studies showed that green tea reduces the amount of bad cholesterol level in our body."* (PM.7.A) *"In my personal point of view, I agree that breatharianism is more of a spiritual method to access the universal*

		consciousness." (PM.43.B) *"I agree that healthy life style is so important to live a great life."* (PM.38.D)
e) I like + noun phrase [subordinator/conj. + -------] *Pre-med e) I like/<u>noun+ verb</u> + noun phrase+ subordinator/conj. + -----	*"I liked this story because it shows women's brain and how they think."* (PN.60.E)	*"I really like this story because it has an educational lesson in behavior, which is the cost of being selfish."* (PM.22.A)
<u>f) [I think] this/there + copula verb+ prepositional phrase+ adjectival clause</u>		*"This is one of those great things that should spread everywhere."* (PM.11.E) *"There is an overwhelming amount of scientific evidence that showed positive effects of sport and physical activity as part of a healthy lifestyle."* (PM.30.C)
<u>g) [With/without the use of 'I think/I like/in my opinion] noun/noun phrase +verb [+noun/noun phrase]+conj. +-------</u>	*"I believe people shouldn't smoke because inevitably their life is being shorten."* (PN.54.C) *"Princess Diana came from a very classy family and she was very kind and soft with the public."* (PN.16.D)	*"Every culture has its own believes <u>and</u> medical practices differ around the world."* (PM.12.C) *"<u>Although</u> chocolate is said to cause acne and tooth decay it still has some healthy factors*." (PM. 7.D)
<u>h) Noun phrase + prepositional phrase +verb +noun phrase /+verbal +----------</u>		*"This movie about an amazing real story was really a good motivation to thank GOD and continue positively think and accepting whatever we have."* (PM. 40.D) *"This timeless story is full of entertainment, exotic yet simple."* (PM.40.C)
<u>i) Subordinator + sentence+ sentence/adjectival clause</u>	*"Even if it is about frog it still a wonderful story."* (PN.4.B)	*"After I read the paragraph I found that lack of sleep has a negative impact on learning and performance."* (PM.32.A) *"Before I read this book last spring break, I had a few misconceptions that this book set straight."* (PM.27.A)
<u>j) The more……, the ..er ……..</u>		*"The more you learn through your experience, the more your life will get easier and happier."* (PM.38.B)

*These patterns and the underlined parts were seen only in the pre-med group's texts.

Table F3.1

Sentence Patterns of the 'Taking Sides: Supporting/Rejecting the Message of the Reading Text' Step and Their Frequency in Texts of Different Cognitive Levels

	Pre-nursing group				Pre-med group				Total
Frequency of use in each cognitive level→ Patterns↓	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
a)[In my opinion]noun/noun phrase [topic]+verb+ noun phrase [+ adjectival clause]	2	4	3	1	5	14	10	2	41
b) [In my opinions/I think] noun/pronoun + cupola verb+ adj/noun/noun phrase+ conj./subordinator/adjective clause	1	7	4	0	1	11	13	2	39
c) [In my opinion/I think] noun/noun phrase + verb+ verbal [+ ----]	0	2	1	0	1	7	1	0	12
d) [My opinion/ I think/noun/noun phrase] copula verb/other verbs+ noun clause *Pre-med d) [My opinion/ I think]/noun phrase + copula verb/other verbs+ noun clause	0	0	3	0	2	4	0	2	11
e) I like + noun phrase [subordinator/conj. + -------] *Pre-med e) I like/noun+ verb + noun phrase+ subordinator/conj. + -------	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	4
f) [I think] this/there + copula verb+ prepositional phrase+ adjectival clause	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	4
g) [With/without the use of 'I think/I like/in my opinion] noun/noun phrase +verb [+noun/noun phrase]+conj. +--------	0	2	2	1	1	1	5	3	15
h) Noun phrase + prepositional phrase +verb +noun phrase /+verbal +----------	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	4
i) Subordinator + sentence+ sentence/adjectival clause	1	2	0	0	2	4	9	0	18
j) The more……, the ..er ……..	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total PN 40, PM 110 (% is based on each group's total no.) Grand total 150	4 (10 %)	18 (42 .5 %)	16 (37 .5 %)	2 (5 %)	14 (13. 6%)	44 (40 %)	41 (37 .2 %)	10 (9 %)	

Table F4

Sentence Patterns Used in the 'Being Philosophical' Step

Patterns	Example: pre-nursing	Example: pre-med
a) Prepositional phrase/noun/pronoun + verb +prepositional phrase [+ conj. Sentence)	*"Being thankful for the things that you have could lead to a very good fortune, but being selfish could lead to a very bad consequences."* (PN.9.C) *"Being a friend is one of the most wonderful thing in life and the real friendship never ends*." (PN.50.B)	*"By achieving your own goals the happier you will be and more satisfied about yourself."* (PM.13.D)
b) It+ copula verb+ adj. + -------	*"In life, it is very important to learn to control our anger."* (PN.26.D)	
c) Subordinator+ sentence, sentence	*"If you are real friend, you have not leave your friends when they need a help."* (PN.17.D)	
d) Noun/noun phrase+ verb+ [adj.]+conj. + sentence	*"Sometime life is not fair for the lovers so we must accept the good things and the bad."* (PN.31.C) *"The impossible does not exist and that no matter how hard the problem is it must be solved."* (PN.36.A)	*"We have a choice in life whether we like our circle of friend to be a small one or a large one, but we don't have a choice in not having friend."* (PM.10.C)

Table F4.1

Sentence Patterns of the 'Being Philosophical' Step and Their Frequency in Texts of Different Cognitive Levels

	Pre-nursing				Pre-med				Total
Frequency of use in each cognitive level→ Patterns↓	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
a) Prepositional phrase/noun/pronoun + verb +prepositional phrase [+ conj.+ sentence)	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	6
b) It+ copula verb+ adj. + -------	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
c) Subordinator+ sentence, sentence	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
d) Noun/noun phrase+ verb+ [adj.]+conj. + sentence	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3
Total PN 9 , PM 2 (% is based on each group's total no.) Grand total 11	0	6 (66.6%)	3 (33.3%)	0	0	0	2 (100%)	0	

Table F5

Sentence Patterns Used in the 'Making a Specific Connection' Step

Patterns	Example: pre-nursing	Example: pre-med
a)[In my opinion/It is] noun/noun phrase/pronoun/ +verb+ noun phrase/noun clause [+adjectival clause] [+ conj.+ -----]	*"The transition from high school to college affected my life in many different ways as any another student." (PN.3.B)*	"*Stress is a normal life event that we should know how to deal with because if we don't our health and family will be affected*." (PM.6.D) *"It have been discovered that mobile phones has more germs than toilets, and they might affect our bodies."* (PM.5.A)
b) Use of quotations from the religious sources to make the connection	_____	*"As mentioned in Quran, "we made from water every living thing."* (PM.9.D)
c)[As an Arab/as a pre-med student] noun/noun phrase +verb+ noun phrase +adjectival clause [+ -----)	*"For me it is the greatest story that ever told, and it's my favorite because it change my life." (PN.40.B)*	*"Stress is a normal life event that we [students] should know how to deal with because if we don't our health and family will be affected."* (PM. 6.D) *"As a pre-med student, my ipad is the most important device I use."* (PM.17.B)
d) Subordinator+ pronoun +verb+ pronoun +verb+----	_____	*"Since I was really young, I heard tens of stories about Muwashahat and Andalusia."* (PM.28.E) *"When I read this article, I think that there is some issue in my method of studying ----."* (PM.29.C)
e) Noun/pronoun+ verb+ [verbal] + noun phrase/pronoun/adj+ noun clause/noun phrase [+subordinator+ sentence]	_____	*"I live my life knowing for sure that both my time and energy are limited."* (PM.36.C) *"As a college student in her second year, I still need more advice about time management."* (PM.50.B)
f)Adverbial phrases/clauses+ sentence		*"On the 12th of June, 2010, I posted my first tweet. "* (PM.3.C) *"No matter how long we talk about mothers we will never finish."* (PM. 59.E)
g) Noun+ adj clause+ verb +noun/noun phrase		*"The fact that the movie is the first Saudi movie to be nominated for the Oscars makes my patriotism increase."* (PM.51.C)

Table F5.1

Sentence Patterns Used in the 'Making a Specific Connection' Step and Their Frequency in Texts of Different Cognitive Levels

	Pre-nursing				Pre-med				Total
Frequency of use in each cognitive level→ Patterns↓	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	
a)[In my opinion/It is] noun/noun phrase/pronoun/ +verb+ noun phrase/noun clause [+adjectival clause] [+ conj.+ -----]	0	0	1	0	0	7	4	1	13
b) Use of quotations from the religious sources to make the connection	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
c)[As an Arab/as a pre-med student] noun/noun phrase +verb+ noun phrase +adjectival clause [+ -----)	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	5
d) Subordinator+ pronoun +verb+ pronoun + sentence	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	8
e) Noun/pronoun+ verb+ [verbal] + noun phrase/pronoun/adj+ noun clause/noun phrase [+subordinator+ sentence]	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	5
f)Adverbial phrases/clauses+ sentence	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	7
g) Noun+ adj clause+ verb +noun/noun phrase	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Total PN 2, PM 58 (% is based on each group's total no.) Grand total 60	0	0	2 (100%)	0	0	11 (19%)	45 (77.5%)	2 (3.4%)	

APPENDIX G

Rhetorical Functions of Personal Pronouns

Table G1

Rhetorical Functions of Personal Pronouns in Each Introductory Step

Pronouns	Types of Introductory Steps→ Rhetorical functions↓	General statement	Taking a side: agr./D.	Taking sides: suppor. msg	Being philosophical	Making a connect.	Total
I	1. Opinion	0	31	27	0	5	63 (47.3%)
	2. Recipient of effect of reading	0	12	10	0	9	31 (23.3%)
	3. Sharing a personal quality/experience	0	1	8	0	30	39 (29.3%)
Total		*0*	*44*	*45*	*0*	*44*	*133 (100%)*
WE	1. Interpretation	0	0	7	3	7	17 (62.9%)
	2. Warning	0	0	0	0	1	1 (3.7%)
	3. Advising/suggesting	0	1	2	1	1	5 (18.5%)
	4. Prediction	0	0	0	1	0	1 (3.7%)
	5. Criticizing	0	0	0	0	2	2 (7.4%)
	6. Referring to others	0	0	0	0	1	1 (3.7%)
Total		*0*	*1*	*9*	*5*	*12*	*27 (100%)*
YOU	1. Advising/suggesting	0	0	1	0	0	1 (10%)
	2. Prediction	0	0	0	0	1	1 (10%)
	3. Warning	0	0	0	0	1	1 (10%)
	4. Defining	0	0	1	0	0	1 (10%)
	5. Interpretation	0	1	1	4	0	6 (60%)
Total		*0*	*1*	*3*	*4*	*2*	*10 (100%)*
Grand total							170

Table G2

Rhetorical Functions of Personal Pronouns in the Introductory Steps in Each Cognitive Level

		General statement				Taking a side: agreeing/disagr.				Taking sides: supporting msg				Being philosophical				Making a connection				total
Pronouns ↓	Cognitive levels of involvement →	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
I	1.Expressing an opinion	0	0	0	0	5	12	11	3	3	10	12	2	-	0	0	-	0	0	5	-	63
	2. Being recipient of an effect from reading:	0	0	0	0			0	0				0	-	0	0	-		0		-	31
	a)demonstration of an understanding					2	1			2	1	4						2		1		
	b) feeling towards the text/author					1	7			0	2	0						0		0		
	c)showing uncertainty					0	0			0	0	0						0		0		
	d)experience of the reading itself or its effect on the reader					0	1			1	0	0						0		6		
	3.Mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support/reject the author's idea	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	0	-	0	0	-	4	0	26	-	39
	Subtotal																					*133*
WE	1. Interpretation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	*0*	*0*			*0*	-	*0*		-	*0*				*17*
	a) Shared knowledge																					
	-world knowledge										*3*	*1*				*3*				*4*	*2*	
	- scientific knowledge										*0*					*0*				*1*		
	b) Shared Experience																					
	c) Explanation										*1*	*1*				*0*				*0*		
											0	*1*				*0*				*0*		
	2.Warning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	1	0	1
	3. Advising/suggesting	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	-	0	1	-	0	0	1	0	5
	4. Prediction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	1	-	0	0	0	0	1
	5. Criticizing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	2	0	2
	6.Referring to others	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	1	0	0	1
	Subtotal																					27
YOU	1.Advising/suggesting	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	1
	2. Prediction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	1	0	1
	3.Warning	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	1	0	1
	4. Defining	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	-	0	0	-	0	0	0	0	1
	5. Interpretation	0	0	0	0		0	0	0		0	0	0	-			-	0	0	0	0	6
	a) Shared knowledge					1				1					1	2						
	b) shared experience									0					1	0						
	c) moral of a story									0					0	0						
	Subtotal																					*10*
Total																						170

APPENDIX H

Discourse Markers in the Conclusion Move

Table H1

Concluding Markers in the Concluding Sentences and Their Frequency

Words/phrases	Pre-nursing	Pre-med	Total
A. Conclusion markers taught in the writing courses			
Finally	7	7	14
All in all	1	10	11
To sum up	4	3	7
In the end	2	1	3
Actually	1	1	2
Indeed	0	11	11
In conclusion	0	7	7
In short	0	4	4
To conclude	0	3	3
In brief	0	2	2
Subtotal	*15*	*49*	*64*
B. Conclusion markers not taught in the writing courses			
So	4	8	12
Really	1	0	1
In addition	1	1	2
Maybe	1	2	3
Unfortunately	1	0	1
However	0	4	4
Eventually	0	2	2
In fact	0	2	2
Therefore	0	2	2
Hence	0	2	2
Overall	0	2	2
Ultimately	0	1	1
In general	0	1	1
Lastly	0	1	1
As a result	0	1	1
More importantly	0	1	1
As a matter of fact	0	1	1
Additionally	0	1	1
Believe it or not	0	1	1
In the future	0	1	1
Subtotal	*8*	*34*	*42*
Grand total	23	83	106

APPENDIX I

A Summary of Literature on 'Conclusion' Move

Table I1

An Overview of Studies on 'Conclusion' Move

Studies	Genre	Name of the concluding move	Main steps	Sub-steps
Katajamaki & Koskela (2006)	Editorials	Coda	Conclusion Moral	
Ledema et al (1994, in Muguma, 2013)	Comment articles	Conclusion	Restatements	
Hyland (1990)	Student essays	Conclusion	Marker Consolidation Affirmation Close	 -Summarizing -Restating -Widening context or perspective of preposition
Liu (2015)	Student essays (following Hyland's (1990) model)	Conclusion	Marker Consolidation Affirmation Close →	 -Appealing -Solution -Prediction/expectation
Henry & Roseberry (1997)	Student essays	- Conclusion (CI) *Expansion (EX)	-Evaluation -Restating/affirming - Personal opinion, acting to CI, Prediction, Solution, Consequence, Summing up, Warning *Evaluation *Sub-evaluation *Identifying greater problem *Analyzing a narrative *A personal response *Giving consequence of problem *Offering alternatives *Prediction *Future direction	
Kusel (1992)	Student essays	Conclusion	-Ground covered -Internal outcomes → *External outcomes →	 -Summary -New information *Implications

			Reservation placed on outcome
Hüttner (2010)	Student essays	Conclusion	-Summary/review -Qualifying and evaluating results -Providing a personal reflection -Providing wider outlook -Presenting new information -Appealing to reader -Acknowledging gratitude

APPENDIX J

Verbs Collocating with Pronoun 'I' in Different Cognitive Levels

The following tables (tables J1-J4) show the number of verbs collocating with pronoun 'I' and their frequencies in texts of all cognitive levels.

Table J1

Verbs Collocating with 'I' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 1

Verbs	Frequency	Simple present	Present perfect progressive	Modal verbs	No.
Think	7 [28%]	6		Can	1
Agree	6 [24%]	6			
Believe	3 [12%]	3			
Am	2 [8%]	2			
See	2 [8%]	2			
Like	1 [4%]	1			
Want/(not)	1 [4%]	1			
Guess	1 [4%]	1			
Know	2 [8%]	1	1		
Total (25)	25 (100%)	23 (92%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	

Table J2

Verbs Collocating with 'I' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 2

Verbs	Frequency	Simple present	Simple past	Simple future	Present perfect	Past progressive	Modal verbs	No.
Think (not)	44 [26.8%]	39				1	Can/Can't	4
Agree/disagree/ (not)	21 [12.8%]	20					Could	1
Believe	13 [8%]	12					Have to	1
Like/ (not)	11 [6.7%]	10	1					
Be (am, was)	10 [6%]	4	6					
See	5 [3%]	2			3			
Want/ (not)	1 [0.%6]	1						
Know/(not)	2 [1.2%]	1			1			
Hope	4 [2.4%]	4						
Have/had	3 [1.8%]	1	1	1				
Wonder	5 [3%]	3	2					
Do	2 [1.2%]	1			1			
Remember	1 [0.6%]	1						
Feel	1 [0.6%]	1						
*Other verbs	41 [25%]	9	26	1	4	1		

Total (164)	164 (100%)	109 (66.4%)	36 (22%)	2 (1.2%)	9 (5.4%)	2 (1.2%)	6 (3.6%)

*The full list is available on request.

Table J3

Verbs Collocating with 'I' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 3

Verbs	No.	Simp pres.	Simp past	Simp fut.	Pres. perf.	Past prog.	Pres. prog.	Past perf.	Past perf. prog.	Modal verbs	
Think (not)	92 [15.6%]	55	8		1					Can/ Can't	28
Agree/disagree / (not)	25 [4.2%]	18								Could/ couldn't	7
Believe/ (not)	19 [3.2%]	15	1							Have to	3
Like/ (not)	22 [3.7%]	19	2							Should	1
Be (am, was)/ been (not)	60 [10.2%]	21	27	9	2					May	1
See	11 [1.8%]	4	1		4					Might	2
Want/(not)	11 [1.8%]	6								Would	5
Know (not)	17 [2.8%]	10	6		1						
Hope	11 [1.8%]	11									
Have/had (not)	35 [6%]	18	16						1		
Do/(not)	19 [3.2%]	7	9	2	1						
Remember	7 [1.1%]	7									
Feel	9 [1.5%]	7	2								
See	6 [1%]	4	2								
Wish	5 [0.85%]	4	1								
Love	4 [0.68%]	4									
Know	10 [1.7%]	10									
*Other verbs	225[38.2%]	82	106	15	14	4	2	1	1		
Total (588)	588 (100%)	302 (51.3%)	181 (30.7%)	26 (4.4%)	23 (3.9%)	4 (0.68%)	2 (0.1%)	1 (0.34%)	2 (0.34%)	47 (7.9%)	

*The full list is available on request.

Table J4

Verbs Collocating with 'I' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 4

Verbs	Frequency	Simple present	Simple past	Modal verbs	no.
Think	8 [36.3%]	6	1	Would rather	1
Agree	3 [13.6%]	3			
Understand	1 [4.5%]	1			
Am	2 [9%]	2			
Live	1 [4.5%]	1			
Like /(not)	2 [9%]	2			
Blame	1 [4.5%]	1			
Hope	1 [4.5%]	1			

Suggest	1 [4.5%]	1		
Know	1 [4.5%]	1		
Thank	1 [4.5%]	1		
Total (22)	22 (100%)	20 (90.9%)	1 (4.5%)	1 (4.5%)

As can be seen, texts of levels 1 and 4 had fewer numbers of verbs and verb tenses while texts of levels 2 and 3 had greater numbers. Whereas in texts of levels 1 and 4, there were only two verb tenses and a few modal verbs, in texts of levels 2 and 3 the variety of verb tenses was considerable. It was most evident in texts of level 3 with the use of 8 different verb tenses and a high usage of modal verbs.

If we review the frequencies thoroughly, we will notice that the most used verbs in all these texts were: think, agree, believe, be (am/was), have (had), used to, like, and read. All of these verbs related to the main functions that 'I' had in the texts: *expressing opinions*, *being recipient of effect of reading*, and *expressing a personal quality*. Table J5 illustrates this further:

Table J5
The Most Frequent Verbs Collocating with 'I' in Texts of All Levels

Verb	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Total no.	Percent %
Think	6	40	64	7	117	14.6
Agree/ (not)	6	20	18	3	47	5.8
Believe	3	12	16	0	31	3.8
Be	2	10	59	2	73	9.1
Have/had	0	3	34	0	37	4.6
Used to	0	10	12	0	22	2.7
Like/ (not)	1	11	21	2	34	4.2
Read	0	9	18	0	27	3.3
Modal verbs	1	6	47	1	55	6.8
Total	19 (out of25)	121 (out of 164)	289 (out of 588)	15(out of 22)	443 (out of 799)	54.98%

It is clear that from a total of 799 verbs used in texts of all cognitive levels that collocated with 'I', 443 of them (54.98%) belonged to the verbs mentioned in the table. The rest of the verbs were those that denoted other functions of pronoun 'I' such as *doer*, *sharing personal experiences*, and *referring to others*.

APPENDIX K

Verbs Collocating with Pronoun 'We' in Texts of Different Cognitive Levels

Table K1

Verbs Collocating with 'We' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 1

Verbs	No.	Simple present	Simple future	Modals
Talk	1 [5%]	1		
Mean	1 [5%]	1		
Know	1 [5%]	1		
Look	1 [5%]	1		
Travel	2 [10%]	2		
Want	1 [5%]	1		
Feel	1 [5%]	1		
Need	1 [5%]	1		
Be	4 [20%]	1	1	(should) 1;(have to) 1
Visit	2 [10%]	2		
See	1 [5%]		1	
Eat	1 [5%]			(must) 1
Determine	1 [5%]			(can) 1
Have	1 [5%]			(can) 1
Learn	1 [5%]			(have to) 1
Total	22 (100%)	12 (60%)	2 (10%)	6 (30%)

Table K2

Verbs Collocating with 'We' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 2

Verbs	No.	Simple present	Simple future	Simple past	Modals
Know	3 [3.4%]	2		1	
Have	7 [8%]	5	2		
Let	1 [1.13%]	1			
Stop	2 [2.2%]	2			
Live	2 [2.2%]	2			
Look at	1 [1.1%]	1			
Do	4 [4.5%]	4			
Have	4 [4.5%]	4			
Get	1 [1.1%]	1			
Think	2 [2.2%]	2			
See	3 [3.4%]	2			(can) 1
Realize	1 [1.1%]	1			
Need	1 [1.1%]	1			
Be	1 [1.1%]	1			
*Other verbs	55 [61.3%]	16	2	6	31
Total 88	88 (100%)	45 (51.1%)	4 (4.5%)	7 (7.9%)	32 (36.3%)

*The full list is available on request.

Table K3

Verbs Collocating with 'We' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 3

Verbs	Frequency	Simp. Pres.	Simp. past	Simp. Future	Pres. Prog.	Pres. perfect	Pres. Perf. prog	Modals
Have	17 [9.6%]	15	1	1				
Know	7 [4%]	5						(should)2
Want	4 [2.2%]	4						
Control	2 [1.1%]	1						(can't) 1
Be	23 [13%]	12	5	3				(should) 3
Do	6 [3.4%]	3			1		1	(can) 1
Need	4 [2.2%]	3						(may) 1
Get	3 [1.7%]	2						
Find	3 [1.7%]	1						(can) 1; (must) 1
Care	1 [0.5%]	1						
Stop	2 [1.1%]	1						(can't) 1
Act	1 [0.5%]	1						
Consider	2 [1.1%]	2						
Hear	3 [1.7%]	2				1		(mustn't) 1
Remember	1 [0.5%]	1						
*Other verbs	97 [55%]	34	10	5	3	3	0	42
Total 176	176 (100%)	88 (50%)	16 (9%)	9 (5.1%)	4 (2.2%)	4 (2.2%)	1 (0.5%)	54 (30.6%)

*The full list is available on request.

Table K4

Verbs Collocating with 'We' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 4

Verbs	Frequency	Simp. pres.	Pres. prog.	Simp. future	Simp. past	Modal
Be	5 [12.8%]	4				(should) 1
Have	4 [10.2%]	4				
Stick	1 [2.5%]	1				
Change	1 [2.5%]	1				
Face	1 [2.5%]	1				
Think	1 [2.5%]	1				
Throw	3 [7.6%]	3				
Realize	1 [2.5%]	1				
Take	1 [2.5%]	1				
Pay	2 [5%]	1		1		
Talk	2 [5%]	2				
Grow	1 [2.5%]	1				
Cover	1 [2.5%]	1				
Demand	1 [2.5%]	1				
*Other verbs	14 [35.8%]	1	2	2	3	6
Total 39	39 (100%)	24 (61.5%)	2 (5.1%)	3 (7.6%)	3 (7.6)	7 (17.9%)

*The full list is available on request.

APPENDIX L

Verbs Collocating with Pronoun 'You' in Texts of Different Cognitive Levels

Table L1

Verbs Collocating with Pronoun 'You' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 1

Verbs	Frequency	Simp. pres.	Pres. prog.	Simp. future	Pres. perf.	Modals
Be	8 [15.6%]	6				(can) 1 (have to) 1
Need	2 [4%]	2				
Find	1 [2%]	1				
Have	4 [7.8%]	4				
Use	2 [4%]	1	1			
Pay	2 [4%]	2				
Like	2 [4%]	2				
Read	1 [2%]	1				
Dislike	1 [2%]	1				
See	3 [5.8%]	1				(can) 2
Move	2 [4%]	2				
Do	1 [2%]	1				
Feel	1 [2%]	1				
Get	2 [4%]	1				(can) 1
Learn	1 [2%]	1				
*Other verbs	18 [35.2%]	5	2	2	1	8
Total 51	51 (100%)	32 (62.7%)	3 (5.8%)	2 (3.9%)	1 (1.9%)	13 (25.4%)

*The full list is available on request.

Table L2

Verbs Collocating with Pronoun 'You' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 2

Verbs	Frequency	Simp. pre.	Pres. pro.	Simp. futu.	Pres. perf.	Simp. past	Modals
Want	4 [4%]	4					
Tell	1 [1%]	1					
Believe	1 [1%]	1					
Have	8 [8%]	5		3			
Say	1 [1%]	1					
See	2 [2%]	2					
Go	1 [1%]	1					
Find	3 [3%]	3					
Stay	1 [1%]	1					
Live	1 [1%]	1					
Waste	1 [1%]	1					
Read	2 [2%]	2					
Know	6 [6%]	5			1		

Do	7 [7%]	3					(can) 4
Work	1 [1%]	1					
Need	4 [4%]	3					(may) 1
*Others	57[56.4%]	22	3	5	3	1	23
Total 101	101(100%)	57 (56.4%)	3 (3%)	8 (7.9%)	4 (4%)	1(1%)	28(27.7%)

*The full list is available on request.

Table L3

Verbs Collocating with Pronoun 'You' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 3

Verbs	Frequency	Simp. pres.	Pres. prog.	Simp. future	Simp. past	Modal
Need	4 [3%]	3				(may) 1
Keep	1 [0.7%]	1				
Do	2 [1.5%]	1				(should) 1
Want	7 [5.2%]	7				
Save	1 [0.7%]	1				
Have	10 [7.5%]	4		5		(have to) 1
Face	2 [1.5%]	1				(may) 1
Think	2 [1.5%]	1				(might) 1
Act	1 [0.7%]	1				
Go	3 [2.2%]	2	1			
Be	17 [12.7%]	6		6	3	(might) 1, (have to) 1
Say	1 [0.7%]	1				
Try	1 [0.7%]	1				
Know	5 [3.7%]	5				
See	3 [2.2%]	3				
*Other verbs	73 [54.8%]	37	4	7	4	21
Total 133	133(100%)	75 (56.3%)	5 (3.7%)	18 (13.5%)	7 (5.2%)	28 (21%)

*The full list is available on request.

Table L4

Verbs Collocating with Pronoun 'You' and Their Frequency in Texts of Level 4

Verbs	No.	Simp. pres.	Simp. future	Modal
Love	1 [5.8%]	1		
Have	2 [11.7%]	2		
Get	1 [5.8%]	1		
Want	2 [11.7%]	1	1	
Find	2 [11.7%]	2		
See	1 [5.8%]	1		
Get	1 [5.8%]	1		
Live	1 [5.8%]	1		
Hear	1 [5.8%]	1		
Sleep	1 [5.8%]	1		
Teach	3 [17.6%]			(can) 3
Take	1 [5.8%]			(can) 1
Total 17	17 (100%)	12 (70.5%)	1 (5.8%)	4 (23.5%)

APPENDIX M

A Summary of the Rhetorical Functions of Pronouns 'I', 'We', and 'You'

Table M1

Summary of the Use and Functions of Pronoun 'I' in Texts of Different Cognitive Levels

Cognitive levels → / Function → / Use↓	Level 1	No & %	Level 2	No & %	Level 3	No & %	Level 4	No & %
	1. Expressing an opinion	18 (72 %)	1. Expressing an opinion, belief, wish	78 (47.5 %)	1. Expressing an opinion, belief, wish	155 (26. 3%)	1. Expressing an opinion, belief, wish	17 (77.2 %)
	2. Being recipient of an effect from reading: a)demonstration of an understanding b) feeling towards the text/author ---------- ----------	5 (20 %) [4] [1]	2. Being recipient of an effect from reading: a)demonstration of an understanding b) feeling towards the text/author c) showing uncertainty d)experience of the reading	57 (34.7 %) [23] [19] [5] [10]	2. Being recipient of an effect from reading a)demonstration of an understanding b) feeling towards the text/author c)experience of the reading itself	60 (10. 2%) [21] [16] [23]	2. Being recipient of an effect from reading -------- b) feeling towards the text/author c) experience of the reading itself	5 (22.7 %)
	3. Mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support the author's idea	2 (8 %)	3. Mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support /reject the author's idea	20 (12.1 %)	3. Mentioning a personal quality or an experience to support/reject the author's idea	351 (59. 5%)	_____	
	_____		_____		4. As the 'doer' of some action	16 (2.7 %)	_____	
			5. Referring to others (quotations)	8 (4.8 %)	5. Referring to others	6 (1%)	----------	
Personal		10 0%		95.2 %		99%		100%
Imperson al		0		4.8%		1%		0

Table M2
Summary of the Use and Functions of Pronoun 'We' in Texts of Different Cognitive Levels

Functions of 'we'	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Total
	Inc.	Exc.	Inc.	Exc.	Inc.	Exc.	Inc.	Exc.	
1. Interpretation	15(68%)	2(9%)	31(35.2%)	16(18.1%)	57(32.3%)	53(30%)	2(5.1%)	8(20.5%)	184
a) Shared knowledge							0	0	[38]
-world knowledge	4[18%]	0	7[7.9%]	0	27[15.3%]	0			
							0	0	[34]
- scientific knowledge	1[4.5%]	0	7[7.9%]	5[5.6%]	18[10.2%]	3[1.7%]			
							1 [2.5%]	1[2.5%]	[74]
b) Shared Experience	8[36.3%]	0	14 [15.9%]	3[3.4%]	8[4.5%]	39[22.1%]	1[2.5%]	7[17.9%]	[38] *(56.6%)*
c) Explanation	2[9%]	2[9%]	3[3.4%]	8[9%]	4[2.2%]	11[6.2%]			
2.Warning	2(9%)	0	5(5.6%)	0	2(1.1%)	1(0.5%)	0	0	10 *(3.7%)*
3. Advising/ suggesting	3(13.6%)	0	17(19.3%)	1(1.1%)	15(8.5%)	16(9%)	3(7.6%)	7(17.9%)	62 *(19%)*
4. Prediction			11(12.5%)	0	8(4.5%)	4(2.2%)	5(12.8%)3	0	28 *(8.6%)*
5. Enquiring (indirect)	0	0	0	1(1.1%)	0	0	0	0	1 *(0.3%)*
6. Ability	0	0	5(4.5%)	1(1.1%)	11(6.2%)	0	0	0	17 *(5.2%)*
7. Criticizing			0	0	7(3.9%)	0	11(28.2%)	3(7.6%)	21 *(6.4%)*
8. Wishing			0	0	0	2(1.1%)	0	0	2 *(0.6%)*
Total	20 (90.9%)	2(9%)	69 (78.4%)	19 (21.5%)	100 (58.5%)	76 (41.4%)	21(53.8%)	18(46.1%)	
Grand total: 325 (100%)	22 (6.7%)		88 (27%)		176 (54.1%)		39 (12%)		

Table M3

Summary of the Use and Functions of Pronoun 'You' in Texts of Different Cognitive Levels

Functions	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4	
	You-audience	You-general	You-audience	You-general	You-audience	You-general	You-audience	You-general
1.Instruction	12(23.5%)	0	0	0	5 (3.7%)	0	0	0
2.Explaining the instruction	6 (11.7%)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3.Advising/ suggesting	8 (15.6%)	0	15(14.8%)	12(11.8%)	15(12.2%)	2(1.5%)	5(29.4%)	0
4. Prediction	0	2 (3.9%)	0	8 (7.9%)	10 (7.5%)	12 (9%)	0	0
5.Warning	0	0	0	0	4 (3%)	0	0	0
6. Enquiring	0	0	0	1 (0.9%)	1 (0.7%)	0	0	0
7. Indirect question	0	0	0	3 (2.9%)	0	0	0	0
8. Hypothetical	0	0	0	0	5 (3.7%)	0	0	0
9. Defining	0	1 (1.9%)		2 (1.9%)	0	3 (2.2%)	0	0
10. Interpretation	5 (9.8%)	17(33.3%)	24 25%)	37(39.7%)	5 (3.7%)	65(48.7%)	1(5.8%)	10 (58.7%)
11. Referring to others	0	0	0	0	0	6 (4.5%)	0	1 (5.8%)
Grand total: 302	31 (60.6%)	20 (39.2%)	39 (38.6%)	62 (61.3%)	45 (33.8%)	88 (66.1%)	6 (35.2%)	11 (64.7%)

APPENDIX N

A Brief Look at the Concordancer Lines Showing Usages of 'I, We, You' and Their Rhetorical Functions

The following is a brief view of the concordancer lines showing instances of usages of 'I', 'we', and 'you' and their rhetorical functions. The complete concordancer lines for each pronoun and their functions in each cognitive level are available upon request.

A. Functions of Pronoun 'I'

1. Expressing an opinion

I am sure that they are sharing for full of sympathy.
I agree with what the author wrote. The internet is a good
I really agree with what the author wrote about the most
I think that in order for peace to be spread and troubles
I believe that smokers should not have a say in the matter, a
I guess they do this study because in the past they using

2. Being recipient of an effect from reading

a) Demonstration of an understanding

I see that all the reason that why he did not have a card
I see why did the writer doesn't want to have a credit card
In this article, I know many things that I have been know it before. Not
In this article, I know many things that I have been know it before. Not only for me also for

b) Feelings towards the text/author

I can express my feeling about the story the man who

c) Showing uncertainty

I can't help but wonder, if this could help those who have
I read this article, I wonder how it can be preserved from the ancient time.
I wonder how it can be preserved from the ancient time.
I don't know how can we found a new solution for treatment

d) Experience of the reading or its effect on the reader's life

This is the first work I read by Kafka, for that reason I can fairly say that it took me some time to Kafka, for that reason I can fairly say that it took me some time to absorb
to absorb and relate this kind of surrealistic stories which I am not used to reading.
At first I thought I was reading Japanese, but that went so well afterward

At first I thought I was reading Japanese, but that went so

3. Sharing personal quality or experience as support for interpretation

I got depressed when my father died four years ago. It
I lost my appetite and had problems in taking decisions
I exactly remember when I was in Bournemouth, Dorset, that
I partially experience that pure mind state when I fast, as a religious practice

4. Referring to others (in quotations)

Iben Batooteh said, "you describe the place, I will describe the
"think about what you want, or worry about what I don't want and in either case that's what you'll …"
The way the novel starts: "Who am I? And how, I wonder, will
The way the novel starts: "Who am I? And how, I wonder , will this story end?" is a notion
"My Lord! Bestow on them Your Mercy as they did bring me up when I was small." Surah al isra.

5. As the 'doer' of some action

it may be does not like it from other people but I advice them to try it.
I will control my life as the way I want it.
I will control my life as the way I want it.
Finally, I advise you to read this story when you try to say a horrible
I will eat the fruit without make it a juice.
For my final writing in class, which will be in the next week, I should write a comparison

B. Functions of pronoun 'We'

Code: I= inclusive-we E: exclusive-we

1. Interpretation

a) Shared Knowledge

i- World knowledge

For example, we can have stress from work, home or even when you're (I)
Change is good, because we cannot learn and become what we need to be by remaining (I)
become what we need to be by remaining what we are. Indeed, changing (I)
and become what we need to be by remaining what we are . (I)

ii- Scientific knowledge

We may be able to live on the others for weeks, but we cannot go on without water (I)
but we cannot go on without water for more than a few days (I)
In the past we used to treat the patients physically ignoring (E)
we can cure his wounds or illness but the main source (E)
children's relations with their mothers. we do not really understand why that is and lot (I)

b) Shared Experience

We all have problems in our life no one except. But (I)
We live in a big world which people speak different (I)

it is what we look up to. The respect is the values that we born (I)
The respect is the values that we born on it or in other word it is our believe in (I)
And just as we would use sunscreen to protect ourselves from sun (E)

c) Explanation
The writer was right when he said that we should be honest and (I)
In addition, with knowing that we can determine that the placebo is very helpful for (E)
In the last paragraph, he explained why we feel pain from acne and how scar could (I)
Luther King listed all these actions after saying " we will not be satisfied" which reflect (E)

2. Warning
because if we don't our health and family will be affected (I)
if we do not kill the time, it will kill us. I think (I)
If we [Saudis]don't do that, the population will decrease and (E)

3. Advising/suggesting
We have to be patient and decrease our problems rationally (I)
I totally agree with the writer that we should learn more than one language since (I)
Thus, we have to figure out a way to understand each other (I)
every day what people about us is their own thoughts we do not have to know it and care (I)

4. Prediction
I stop when I CAN NOT eat more", and that what we start to be. American restaurants (E)
If we can understand and feel the pain of others then it is not possible that we will not feel (I)
it is not possible that we will not feel obligated to remove them of that pa (I)
And whatever we [Muslims] reach from knowledge we will still be losing a (E)
And whatever we reach from knowledge we will still be losing a lot of fragments that (E)

5. Ability
But we can manage our life and get rid of it. If we let (I)
about a really important issue which I hope if we can solve it and return all people as they(I)
smartness is a relative concept. We can raise our smartness as well as hinder (I)
I think it is only we who stimulate stress. We tend to create a whole (I)

6. Inquiring
I don't know how can we found a new solution for treatment of obese people (E)

7. Criticizing
[dogs] are and will always remain our friend. Where can we find this quality in humans? (I)
All we care about is ourselves. We never stop and think (I)
We never stop and think of our loved ones, and what (I)
We just act . HPVs are common infection (I)

8. Wishing
It is imperative device. Hopefully, we will be able to see the device in Saudi Arabia, m (E)
hope that people become more aware about organic food and that we have more organic (E)

C. Functions of pronoun 'You'
Code: A=You-Audience, G= You-General

1. Instructions
Third warm up very fast as you are in the race and do it for one hundred meters and (A)
And if you dislike a book be creative and change it as you (A)
if you dislike a book be creative and change it as you like (A)
not just read ,think criticize and discuss what you have just read . Also, read people's (A)
Also, read people's opinion about the book that you read .They may have Nursing and (A)

2. Explaining the instructions
For longer race you need more energy so trying to warm your body more (A)
Then worm up very fastly like you are in the race for one hour. Repeating it for on (A)
may have new idea that contrast with the book and you may find it interesting. (A)
Also, to help you to be creative change the way you dress and the way you move (A)

3. Advising/Suggesting
is no specific injection to prevent Alzheimer but you can prevent it by eat more fruit and (G)
problems rapidly and your schedule tasks that way you wouldn't have to worry. (A)
with 35 pounds for a whole day to understand what pregnant women suffer if you can. (A)
Finally, make sure that you use it in the right way. (A)

4. Prediction
So if you follow the instruction in these article you will (G)
you will have an efficient management of time in all (G)
Moreover, I think you will decrease the anxiety and dispersion of (G)
the anxiety and dispersion of thought while you do your tasks. (G)
would help you a lot with studying and you may do not need to as (G)

5. Enquiring
So what can you do to prevent transforming germs through your phone (G)
First of all, do you know what the adequate water intake is? The amount (A)

6. Defining

the golden attitude, it asks you to look for and at the good thing in whatever you face. (G)
concept goes to breatharianism., in which you persuade your mind that food is not (G)
Friend, who takes care of you, be with you when you need him or her, advises you (G)
be with you when you need him or her, advises you and does a (G)

7. Interpretation
a) Shared group/world knowledge and scientific truths
You can find a lot of style [watches] for your requirements such as daily life, sport, and (A)
Moreover, when you listen to what other people say to you, you can (G)

you can see what you can't see in yourself and (G)
you can see what you can't see in yourself and (G)
were easy to get them, the life was simple now you should work hard to get what (G)
work hard to get what you want. (G)

b) Shared experience

You waste time when you read a paper like this kind. (G)
You waste time when you read a paper like this kind. However, I like the (G)
For example, previously if you go for eye check-up then the traditional method (A)
easy to ask help from family members study when you have some difficulty with studying (A)
because they may have studied different major than you did . So you have to get involve (A)

c) Moral of the story

I now believe more than ever that when you hate something, it may be the best thing (G)
being single-minded is the key to reach whatever you want despite of any obstacle (G)
whatever you want despite of any obstacle you may face. Deciding what you want (G)
after I read the passage, I learned that some time you may need to use another language (G)

8. Indirect question

part I was interested about how do you know if you drink enough water or not, it is a (G)
if you drink enough water or not, it is a simple way to (G)
If you ask your friends what to do to cure cold or flu, (G)

9. Enquiring

First of all, do you know what the adequate water intake is? (A)
So what can you do to prevent transforming germs through your phone (G)

10. Hypothetical

Put yourself in this condition if you are dying and there is no one that could take care (A)
no one that could take care of your child you would love that your child live a normal ife (A)
If it's hard to raise him you could take him in vacations and eid .For me I would (A)

11. Referring to others

never listen to others even if they said that this matter is difficult and you cannot resolve (G)
When I entered Medicine everyone says to me that you cannot make it, it is hard to (G)
everything was normal so he asked me are you going through stress lately, and if you (G)
and if you are, stop being stressed and come after one week, (G)